

JESUS
AND THE SAMARITAN WOMAN

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

C.K. BARRET, Durham - P. BORGÉN, Trondheim

J.K. ELLIOTT, Leeds - H.J. DE JONGE, Leiden

A.J. MALHERBE, New Haven - M.J.J. MENKEN, Heerlen - J. SMIT SIBINGA, Amsterdam

Managing Editor: D.P. MOESSNER, Decatur

VOLUME LXV



JESUS AND THE SAMARITAN WOMAN

A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42

BY

J. EUGENE BOTHA



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1991

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Botha, J. Eugene.

Jesus and the Samaritan woman: a speech act reading of John 4:1-42/by J. Eugene Botha.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum.
ISSN 0167-9732: v.65)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

1. Bible. N.T. John IV. 1-42 — Language, style. 2.
Bible. N.T. John — Language, style. 3. Speech acts (Linguistics) I. Title. II. Series.

BS2615.2.B64 1991

226.5'066—dc20

91-31184

CIP

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 90 04 09505 5

© Copyright 1991 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, SALEM MA 01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface.....	ix
--------------	----

CHAPTER ONE

PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE STYLE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN PAST RESEARCH

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Different approaches to Johannine style	3
2.1 The traditional approach.....	3
2.2 Johannine style studies for secondary purposes	13
2.2.1 Style and sources.....	13
2.2.2 Style and the unity of the Gospel.....	22
2.2.3 Style and the Aramaic origin of the Gospel.....	25
2.2.4 Style and other Johannine writings.....	28
a. The letters of John and John's Gospel	29
b. The Apocalypse and the Gospel of John	30
2.2.5 The study of style for other reasons.....	30
2.3 Research on individual aspects of Johannine style	31
2.3.1 Irony.....	32
2.3.2 The Fourth Gospel as drama.....	32
2.3.3 Johannine misunderstanding and double meaning.....	33
2.3.4 Certain individual grammatical aspects.....	33
2.3.5 Certain poetic qualities.....	34
2.3.6 Explanatory notes in the Gospel.....	34
2.3.7 Numerical patterns.....	34
2.3.8 The literary structure	35
2.3.9 Other literary devices.....	36
2.3.10 Narrative art in John.....	37
2.3.11 John and reception theory.....	37
3. Conclusion	39

CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS STYLE?

1. The history and theory of contemporary stylistics.....	41
1.1 Historical development	42
1.2 The current situation.....	48
1.3 Approaching a definition of style.....	53
2. Style and John's Gospel.....	54

CHAPTER THREE
SPEECH ACT THEORY, STYLE AND JOHN 4:1-42: SOME
PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

1. Introduction	62
2. Speech Act Theory	63
2.1 Sentences vs utterances	64
2.2 Performatives	64
2.3 Locution, illocution and perlocution	65
2.4 Appropriateness conditions or felicity conditions	66
2.5 The cooperative principle and maxims	68
2.6 Shared knowledge, beliefs and presumptions	71
2.7 Indirect speech acts	72
2.8 Literary works and audiences	72
2.9 Literary speech acts as 'display texts'	73
2.10 The literary speech situation	74
3. Some advantages of Speech Act Theory for the study of style	76
3.1 The concept of utterances	76
3.2 Literary texts and verbal interaction	76
3.3 Importance of context	77
3.4 Rule-governed behavior	77
3.5 Speech act theory and reception theory	78
3.6 Implicature	78
3.7 Appellative power	79
3.8 Speech act theory and narratology	79
3.9 Appropriateness conditions	79
3.10 Interpersonal relationships	80
3.11 The success of utterances	80
3.12 The author's obligations	80
3.13 Rules and rule-breaking	80
3.14 Context and style	81
4. John 4 as literary speech act	81
4.1 Levels of analysis	81
4.2 Types of speech acts involved	83
4.3 Some specifics of John chapter 4	84
4.3.1 The character level	85
4.3.2 The level of the implied author and readers	88

CHAPTER FOUR

A SPEECH ACT READING OF JOHN 4:1-42

1. Units of analysis.....	96
2. The incident in Samaria analyzed.....	97
2.1 4:1-4 General introduction to the story.....	97
2.2 Brief summary of 4:1-4	104
2.3 4:5-7a Specific introduction to the story	105
2.4 Brief summary of 4:5-7a	112
2.5 4:7b-26 Dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman.....	114
2.5.1 4:7b-15 The first half of the dialogue.....	115
a. 4:7b-9 Opening the dialogue.....	115
b. Brief summary of 4:7b-9	120
c. 4:10-15 Discussion on life-giving water	122
d. Brief summary of 4:10-15	135
2.5.2 4:16-26 The second half of the dialogue	138
a. 4:16-26 The topic under discussion changes.....	138
b. Brief summary of 4:16-26	154
2.6 4:27-42 The story continues	159
2.6.1 4:27-30 Transition: The disciples return and the woman departs.....	160
2.6.2 Brief summary of 4:27-30.....	165
2.6.3 4:31-38 'Meanwhile'	168
2.6.4 Brief summary of 4:31-38.....	179
2.6.5 4:39-42 Conclusion of the story.....	183
2.6.6 Brief summary of 4:39-42.....	186

CHAPTER FIVE

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS REGARDING JOHANNINE STYLE BASED ON A SPEECH ACT READING OF JOHN 4:1-42

1. Introduction.....	188
2. Johannine style in John 4:1-42.....	188
2.1 General observations.....	189
2.1.1 An impression regarding style	189
2.1.2 Style and choice.....	190
2.2 Ensuring readers' involvement.....	190
2.3 The manipulation/victimization/unstabling of readers.....	191
2.4 The stylistic choice of the context.....	192
2.5 Rules and rule-breaking.....	193
2.6 The interaction of the various style features.....	194
2.7 The use of intertexts.....	195

2.8 Realism of the verbal interaction	196
2.9 Style and interpersonal communication	196
2.10 Different levels of communication in the text	197
2.11 The style 'between the lines'	197
2.12 Speech act theory and reception theory.....	198
2.13 Characteristic usages.....	199
3. Conclusion	199
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	201
INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND SOURCES.....	215

PREFACE

As the title of this book suggests, this study deals for the greater part with a speech act reading of a passage in the Gospel of John. This reading is not merely done to enhance the exegesis of the passage, but serves a very specific aim: It is done to discover something of the style of the Fourth Gospel.

In Johannine research the question of style has been neglected somewhat in the past, and was very seldom studied as such. Mostly the aspect of style has been raised to facilitate other objectives. Furthermore, a comprehensive approach to Johannine style in terms of modern developments in the field of stylistics, linguistics, pragmatics and literary theory is still absent. A study dealing with the style of John is thus long overdue. In this work Johannine style is dealt with from a number of perspectives. I have approached this subject from a *historical*, a *theoretical* and a *practical* angle. A historical part has proved to be necessary because of past neglect of the matter, a theoretical part is necessary due to the fact that modern stylistics has so far exerted little influence on biblical scholars dealing with Johannine style, and this necessitates a discussion of the theory and presuppositions inherent in a treatment of style in general. Furthermore, a comprehensive approach to Johannine style in terms of modern developments in the field of stylistics, linguistics, pragmatics and literary theory is still absent, and this prompted a pragmatic discussion of a specific pericope.

The above serves both as a motivation for the current study and as regulatory principle in the structure of the argumentation followed. Since there has to date been no systematization of Johannine style studies done during the course of this century, it is inevitable that this should be done in a study dealing with Johannine style. In the *first chapter* I deal with this problem, and different approaches to Johannine style are identified. The deficiencies in the perceptions regarding style in Johannine style are indicated, and serves to indicate that there are indeed unresolved problems in this area. It must be stressed however, that this historical survey does not pretend to be a comprehensive account of Johannine scholarship during the course of this century. It is an attempt to somewhat systematize, and to some extent identify, the different approaches to, and perceptions of style in Johannine research so far.

Any study dealing with style as such, should also necessarily deal with some theoretical observations. This is necessary because the present state of affairs in this discipline must be taken into account before an attempt at utilizing the concepts offered by modern style studies, can be made. I do this in the *second chapter*. However, I have found that there are enormous terminological

problems within this field, stemming from the factors that played a role in the development of this modern-day discipline. This is the reason for the brief historical survey found in this chapter. The rest of chapter two deals with the theory of style as I perceive it, and serves to substantiate the approach this work follows. I realize, of course, that a considerable amount of space in the book is taken up in discussing historical and theoretical matters. However, as indicated, the lack of any previous studies in this regard necessitates these discussions. I try to be as brief as possible in dealing with these aspects, but a discussion of these matters is inevitable.

Because of the arguments raised in chapter two, I have decided to attempt, for the first time in Johannine research, a detailed examination of the style of the Fourth Gospel *from a speech act perspective*. I deal with this in *chapter three*. Since speech act theory is relatively new to biblical studies, and certainly so to Johannine studies, it is necessary to explain certain features of this theory of language communication. This study is mainly aimed at Johannine scholars and New Testament scholars, and since speech act theory has not to any significant extent been utilized by them, some explanation of the theory is necessary. The relevance of this approach for the study of style is also briefly indicated, as well as the relevance of this for the reading of John 4. It is my belief that this approach to language which deals with the notion of speech as doing something with words, is so comprehensive in describing these speech acts, that most of the factors pertaining to style are accommodated in these descriptions.

The next chapter (*chapter four*) contains a comprehensive speech act reading of John 4:1-42, the incident at the well, in which the dynamics of the language used is elucidated. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that such a comprehensive speech act reading of a Johannine text has been done, and is in that respect somewhat experimental. A brief summary of each section of the text is also provided and is designed to help the reader to recapitulate. This also summarizes the speech acts employed for the sake of clarity. In addition to the light shed on the style of the pericope, this speech act reading has proved to be of importance for understanding the communication of the text a little better. The enormous potential speech act theory holds for New Testament exegetes also becomes apparent and provides for a very novel reading of the dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman. It is an advantage of this study that the application of speech act theory both illuminates aspects of style, and provides New Testament exegesis with some additional insights with which to approach the text. It seems that speech act theory is a very handy tool to add to the arsenal of tools we have at our disposal for understanding the dynamics of the textual communication of ancient texts.

Finally, observations regarding style, based on the reading of the text in chapter four, is given in the final chapter (*chapter five*). These observations are

to some extent novel, in that concepts of speech act theory, narratology, reception theory, literary and linguistic analysis are combined, and explained in terms of their relevance to style.

I hope that these introductory remarks regarding the nature and structure of this book will facilitate a better understanding of problems I am addressing in this study, and of the way in which I deal with them. I also hope that they will also induce readers to accompany me on a journey of discovery into the enigmatic world of Johannine style.

I have chosen the Harvard reference technique to use as system of reference, and have not utilized footnotes at all. As guide to this system I have used Kilian (1989), which is also used by the New Testament and Old Testament Societies of South Africa. Since the medium of this book is English, I have tried to keep to this language as far as possible. Where no adequate translation of a specific work is available, I have given the original — that is, for German and French. More unfamiliar language quotations such as in Afrikaans and Dutch were translated by me. Where translations of foreign languages exist, I have used them in quotations, but I have also given the page numbers of the original.

This book is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation completed in November of 1989 at the University of South Africa. After the approval of the dissertation in early 1990, I have had the privilege of spending a sabbatical in the United States of America at the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research in Collegeville, Minnesota from September 1990 to June of 1991. It is during this period that I could devote some time and effort to revise the original text of the dissertation and to prepare the final copy. Despite the fact that writing a dissertation or book creates, at times, a feeling of extreme isolation and loneliness, it is by looking back that one discovers that this is actually far from the truth. Assessing an academic endeavor such as this, tends to make one aware of the fact that it is not an individual effort, and that quite a number of people were willingly and sometimes unwillingly part of it. I can but mention a few of them. The order in which they are addressed does not indicate that some are more important than others.

The supervisor of the original dissertation, professor Willem Vorster, always left me with the impression that we were working together towards a goal, that we were colleagues, and not opponents. This enhanced the pleasure of working and writing. I am also deeply indebted to him for his inspiring and expert advice, right from the start. To have worked with, and under him is indeed a great honor. Furthermore, to have the supervisor as a friend at the end of the dissertation, is an even greater privilege.

A sincere word of thanks to my colleagues in the Department of New Testament at the University of South Africa whose suggestions, advice, support, and friendship greatly encouraged me.

I must also mention the 1990/1991 residents at the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research who all in some way or the other assisted me with either encouragement or advice, especially Con Casey from Ireland and John Collins and Ned Kelly from Australia who, by example and friendship, provided me with enough friendship and encouragement to complete this book whilst working on some other projects.

However, it must also be recognized that not only professional theologians contributed to the production of a work such as this. My mother, Charlotte Brits, who taught me the pleasure of reading, and the rewards of acquiring knowledge, is probably the person who contributed the most in influencing and inspiring me from my youth, to pursue my studies up to this point. For this I am really grateful.

Thanks also to Stefan and Anja, who constantly reminded me that there is also another real world beyond the theological one. Someday they will understand.

My wife Dalene, as always, was there when I needed her. To share a dissertation, and life, whether in Collegeville, Minnesota or Pretoria, South Africa, with someone like her, is a rare pleasure indeed. A friend and companion like her, makes everything worthwhile. This book is therefore, dedicated to her.

Eugene Botha
Collegeville, Minnesota
May 1991

CHAPTER ONE

PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE STYLE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN PAST RESEARCH

1. Introduction

The style of the Fourth Gospel is a subject which receives relatively little attention in modern Johannine research. This in fact holds true for most of the research done since the beginning of this century. A close scrutiny of the well-known lists and catalogues of research publications on the Johannine writings reveals that, although questions related to Johannine language and literary criticism were indeed of importance, with the exception of Malatesta (1967:36-40), McPolin (1980:3-26) and Van Belle (1988:55-56, 120-128) not one of the catalogues has a specific rubric on the question of Johannine style or language. Hartwig Thyen (1974:1), in an exhaustive and formidable compilation of literature on the Johannine writings set himself a number of objectives and states that 'schliesslich sollen Sprache und Stil des Evangeliums erörtert... und die künftigen Aufgaben der Forschung präzisiert werden'.

In subsequent years Thyen (1977:211-270; 1977:328-354; 1979:97-134) continued to publish research accounts in the *Theologische Rundschau* but never completed his set task of also discussing Johannine language and style and identifying future fields of study.

His successor, Jürgen Becker (1982:279-301, 305-347; 1986:1-78) who took it upon himself to complete this task, has as yet also not dealt specifically with Johannine style in his bibliography of Johannine research up to 1984. Becker perhaps did not deem it necessary to do so for the simple reason that virtually no research had been done during the preceding decades dealing *specifically* with the question of Johannine style, although some aspects of style and language were dealt with indirectly. This is also reflected in other research surveys and bibliographies on Johannine research, where no mention of specific interest in Johannine style is made. We mention only a few of these bibliographies and research surveys done in the past fifteen years to prove this point: Nicol (1972b:8-18), Kysar (1975; 1983:314-323), Scobie (1976-77:185-193), Smith (1981:41-44), O'Grady (1982:54-58), Schnackenburg (1983:281-287), Olsson (1985:106-126) and Carson (1983; 1989). McPolin (1980:3-26) is one of the few who makes at least some mention of a limited interest in Johannine style and Carson (1983; 1989) mentions a growing interest in '*new literary criticism*', but does not refer specifically to '*style*'. The very exhaustive bibliography by Van Belle (1988:53-103) has under the heading '*Philological*

studies' a subdivision 'style and language' where the Aramaic question, grammar and syntax, and stylistic characteristics are treated. Under '*stylistic characteristics*' only nineteen titles of studies on the style of John since 1965 are mentioned, and a number of these deal only incidentally with style in the pursuit of other objectives, such as Nicol (1972a:16-27), Ruckstuhl (1977:125-147) and Teeple (1974:253-260). We will return to the nature of these so-called stylistic characteristics a little later.

It would seem that the whole question of the style of the Johannine writings and specifically the style of the Gospel is a rather neglected field in both past and current research. (For earlier bibliographies see Haenchen 1955:295-230 and Malatesta 1967:25-54.) With some reservations therefore, we can agree with Olsson (1974:3) that

the linguistic problems occupy little space in *modern Johannine research*. This is dominated by Source Criticism and *Religionsgeschichte*. The perspective is almost invariably comparative and historico-genetic. To arrive at analyses of Johannine language and style one must, if one ignores the commentaries, go back to works published at the turn of the century and the decades immediately thereafter, or, for investigations of 'style statistics', to Schweizer 1939 and Ruckstuhl 1951 and some papers in between [Olsson's italics].

Although it is true that most of the studies done during the past few decades have been, in Olsson's terms, 'comparative and historico-genetic', it cannot be conceded that the only real analyses of Johannine style and language were done at the turn of the century or that the work done at that time was in fact different from later work. The works mentioned by Olsson (1974:3) can to a great extent also be classified as historico-genetic and comparative, and the approach in determining style is not really different from that of the later 'style statisticians'. From this one can furthermore conclude that essentially the approach to Johannine style, where it functioned at all, has remained static for most of this century and its scope has been very limited. The same type of methodology has been used repeatedly, and the same type of research has been prevalent regardless of what the reason for the interest in the style of the Gospel was. Only in the last two decades or so has the study of the language of John received some new stimuli. We will describe these developments a little later.

Another important aspect which must be kept in mind is that, although very little *specific* research has been done on the style of John's Gospel, the whole question of style in the Fourth Gospel was by no means ignored completely. The problem is that the style of John was invariably studied not for the sole purpose of determining its and the function of the features in the Gospel, but for subsidiary reasons such as to prove or disprove authorship, sources, redaction and so forth. This will become clearer as different approaches to John's style during this century are discussed. The survey presented here is necessary in that it analyses the research done and determines what perception

of style played a role in the methodology. Once this is done, a clearer picture will begin to emerge as to what the different approaches in the past considered style to be. Some of the deficiencies of these approaches can then be elucidated.

2. *Different approaches to Johannine style*

What follows in this particular section is far from a complete list and discussion of what has been done in the field of Johannine (style) studies. It is rather an attempt to identify the different *approaches to* and *perceptions of* Johannine style as it emerged during the past seven or eight decades of this century and to analyze and describe these approaches in the light of the theme of this book. The analyses of the different approaches will be done *thematically* rather than *chronologically*, because a thematic discussion of the different approaches will elucidate the problems pertaining to the content, scope and methodology involved in each individual approach, somewhat better.

2.1. *The traditional approach*

The type of approach to be discussed under this heading is called '*traditional*' as it is representative of the typical perception of style which was prevalent during the nineteenth century and which also continued without much alteration to the twentieth century. This way of dealing with style and typifying an author's personal touch was the customary and accepted one for dealing with classical writers and this methodology was transferred to the study of New Testament style and language. Most New Testament scholars today are also inclined to take this view of style. In this method of approaching style the characteristics of a certain author or group of writings are presented by means of the mere *listing* of certain features of vocabulary, word usages and syntactic and grammatical eccentricities. This has the implication that the style of an author or document can be determined satisfactorily merely by listing such features. This was, and perhaps still is, the customary way of representing style.

This approach to the style of individual authors is the legacy of the nineteenth century where the language and style of the New Testament as a whole was characterized in this manner. Hatch (1889), Simcox (1889) and Kennedy (1895) are examples of this depiction of style. The above-mentioned remarks also holds true for studies of the style of individual authors done at the turn of the century, such as Goodspeed (1912:92-96), Krenkel (1894), Cadbury (1920) on Luke, and Adams (1895) on Paul's vocabulary. Most of the grammars dealing specifically with New Testament Greek and its characterization, follow this tradition, and are still in revised form important to New Testament scholars to this day. For examples of this see Blass and Debrunner (1961), Robertson (1923), Moule (1959) and Zerwick (1963). In the following paragraphs, we will

discuss a number of examples of scholars dealing with Johannine style in this way.

Example 1: In this tradition Abbott published one of the most thorough and profound studies on Johannine style and vocabulary in the form of two monographs in 1905 and 1906, dealing with Johannine vocabulary and grammar respectively. Regarding the framework of his monographs, Abbott (1906:1) states:

Obscurity of style in an inflected language is caused by ambiguity (1) in words, (2) in inflections of words, (3) in combinations of words. The First Part of this work, *Johannine vocabulary*, dealt with characteristic, or characteristically used, Johannine words, such as 'believe', and 'authority', with the principal Johannine synonym, and with the relation between the Johannine and the Synoptic vocabularies.

Abbott (1906:1) then continues to state his objectives with respect to the second volume of his work, since aspects such as inflections and combinations of words could not be discussed in the first volume. He states that he has two objects in mind, first to determine the evangelist's meaning, and secondly to contrast the Fourth Gospel with the other three. The above then is what Abbott sees as his task and purpose in discussing Johannine style in both these volumes. In the first volume called *Johannine vocabulary*, Abbott (1905:1) begins in the introduction to explain the problem as he sees it: 'The first step towards helping readers of the Fourth Gospel to solve the problem presented by its vocabulary and style is to make them see that a problem exists.' The problem for Abbott lies in the fact that Johannine language is rather obscure (Abbott 1905:1-4), and the way in which he deals with this problem is to start collecting parallel instances of verbal forms and so on, where they are *ambiguous*, specifically in contexts where Abbott believes the author is uninfluenced by others. Abbott (1905:5) argues that 'many details of Johannine style may be explained by merely collecting parallel instances... This statement applies to most things in his Gospel that proceed from the author *himself*... But the case is altered when we come to ambiguities, symbolism and even literal statements that have the appearance of being allusive'. In this last instance Abbott (1905:6) solves the problem by comparing John with those to whom the allusions are made, that is, the other evangelists.

After a short introduction where the above-mentioned scope and methodology of the work is discussed, Abbott undertakes to solve the problem of Johannine vocabulary in three parts. The first part deals with '*Johannine key-words*', the second with '*Johannine and synoptic disagreements*' and the third with '*Johannine and synoptic agreements*'.

In the first part Abbott discusses certain 'key-words'. These key-words comprise surprisingly only *two*: 'believing' and 'authority'. This is followed by a discussion of a number of synonyms used in the Gospel, namely seeing, hearing, coming, worshipping, going away, going on a journey. It is never explained why

these words were specifically chosen and not others. Although Abbott does not state this specifically, apparently the criterion was *frequency of usage*. This seems rather inadequate even in Abbott's own framework, as the determination of style certainly involves much more than frequency of usage. It also remains obscure why Abbott (1905:14) chose to discuss specifically 'believing' and 'authority' so extensively, although he remarks:

We shall begin with one clue-word... 'believe' which pervades the whole of the Fourth Gospel in such a way that to follow the Evangelist's use of it is to trace... the development of his doctrine as well as the method of his style... we shall try to gain a general view of the writer's use of words — his repetitions of the same word in the same phrase, his repetitions of the same word in a slightly different form of the phrase, his repetitions of the same... phrase with a slightly different form of the word.

However, merely describing how an author uses certain words and what synonyms an author utilizes, says very little about the style of the author. It is at most *interesting* to note the frequency of usage and so forth, but conclusions concerning style should be based on more than this. In any case, Abbott never draws any conclusions as to the style of John, based on this first part of the book. It is merely a compilation of information which is valuable, but not for the purpose he had in mind.

While Abbott professes to be discussing the meaning of *Greek words*, he is actually discussing contextual matters and the theological imports of the *English concepts*. This misleads the reader of his work into supposing that Abbott discusses the meaning of the *Greek words*, while in actual fact he allows certain factors which are contextually determined to influence his judgment of the meaning of the words themselves. In this way, the theology or theological concepts of John in certain passages are discussed and not the *meaning* of the words as Abbott proposes to do. This results in theological discussions where even Abbott's own aims are defeated and his propositions are not adhered to. A single example will suffice to illustrate this point.

In John 4:21 Jesus says to the Samaritan woman πιστεύε μοι. Instead of granting that πιστεύειν in John can have more than one meaning, Abbott (1905:48,50) insists that it must mean more and must have some relationship with trust:

Under ordinary circumstances... we might suppose the words... to have been merely an asseveration meaning... but we must have regard to the fact that this is an utterance of Christ... and the Gospel has hitherto appeared to be carrying us from stage to stage in the development of doctrine of trusting... now the woman of Samaria is bidden to 'trust Him' in the assurance that worship (which is the 'looking up' of heart) will be effectual wherever it is offered 'in spirit and truth'.

From this it is clear that Abbott does not distinguish between the possible *meanings* of words and their *theological reference*. This makes it virtually impossible for Abbott to say anything regarding style and vocabulary other than

the listing of instances where a specific word occurs and then discussing this specific context. By doing this, he is defeating his own aims, and with reference to style nothing is actually elucidated, as the example above clearly indicates. The same holds true for the rest of the discussion of 'key-words' in this work by Abbott. It can be granted to Abbott that it is helpful to have a list of occurrences of different Greek words in John's Gospel but then again, a concordance could also suffice. The same goes for Abbott's discussion of Johannine synonyms where there is also a listing of only certain synonyms (not all that occur in John) and a short discussion of only certain contexts where those that do occur. This is not satisfactory and gives no real insight into the *style* of the author of John's Gospel, despite Abbott's assurances that it does. At most, one is made aware of the author's preference for certain words, but what the implication for an analysis of style is, Abbott unfortunately never indicates. This deficiency in Abbott's approach is also very much present in most of the studies done on Johannine style this century. Certain 'characteristic' features are merely *listed*. One gets the impression that this approach to style rests on the conviction that to know the different words an author uses and how he employs them syntactically, is all that needs to be known in order to classify and analyze the author's style. This is of course in today's terms a much too narrow view of style, but traditionally accepted.

In the second and third parts of his book on Johannine vocabulary, Abbott tabulates in an *English* alphabetical list firstly Johannine deviations from synoptic vocabulary. In footnotes Abbott then tries to explain why John should differ from the synoptics, but as Abbott (1905:157) himself admits this is rather futile in his paradigm, and concludes that 'still less would it be possible to assign in each case his motive for the omission or variation of expression'.

By giving statistics of how John's Gospel differs from synoptic vocabulary, very little is said about John's style as such. Knowing that John differs from the other Gospels is hardly surprising — after all, John was written at a different time, for a different community and at a different place. It is not at all astonishing that there are differences. To know what these differences entail is interesting, but Abbott does not indicate the relevance of this for the style of the Gospel. The question also arises as to why Johannine vocabulary should be contrasted with *only* the synoptic tradition. What about the rest of the New Testament, and even the whole corpus of Koine or Hellenistic Greek? The same goes for the subsequent list where Abbott discusses synoptic deviations from Johannine vocabulary in the same way. Deviations are important indicators of style, but it must also be explained *why* the deviation occurs, and why it is considered significant.

The third part of Abbott's book on Johannine vocabulary deals with words peculiar to John and the three synoptic Gospels, in different combinations, for example words mostly peculiar to John and Mark; John and Matthew; John and Luke; John, Mark and Matthew; John, Mark and Luke; John, Matthew and

Luke. This is also given in the form of lists of words, but however interesting it may be, very little is said about John's style, and even the conclusions drawn by Abbott (1905:348-354) fail to give any substantial information with respect to Johannine style, other than making one aware of the fact that John uses certain words the synoptic Gospels do not — which, as already mentioned, is not very surprising. It must be stressed, however, that this work done by Abbott is not all worthless — it is indeed valuable in the sense that it tabulates the words John prefers to the synoptics, but it can hardly be called more than a preliminary study of style, as it touches on only one very small aspect of style, namely vocabulary. By merely *listing* and *describing* vocabulary very little about Johannine style as such is revealed. It is clear that Abbott (1905:353) also senses this is clear from the statement: 'It is not enough about any writer... to know merely what verbs, nouns and prepositions he likes and dislikes. We must also know something of his syntax.' Abbott (1905:353-354) then continues and state that ambiguities, repetitions, arrangement and so on are peculiarities of John's style, and also need to be discussed in full, since in the preceding sections the emphasis was on single words and the grammar and vocabulary need also to be considered.

In his *second volume* Abbott (1906:2) mentions that the object of this study is to determine the evangelist's meaning and to compare and contrast his Gospel with the language and grammar of the other three Gospels. He divides this book into two parts, the first dealing with forms and combinations of words and the second with arrangement, variation, and repetition of words, with two appendixes dealing with twofold meanings and events and readings of Codex Vaticanus not adapted by Westcott and Hort.

This discussion of 'forms and combinations of words' amounts to nothing more than a simple listing of words, adjectives, adverbs, cases, tenses, prepositions, pronouns and so forth, used by John in his Gospel, with some discussion of certain contexts. This closely resembles a traditional grammar textbook where the same practice is followed, with the exception that here most of the examples come from John. Again the question arises as to how a simple description of certain usages in John, which are after all not exclusively Johannine, can contribute to the analysis of *style*. In most instances where Abbott seems to imply that we have a special characteristic Johannine usage or meaning, it is clear that it is not the word, tense or case which is used in a peculiar way, but that the *content* of the passage or the *context* indicates the peculiarity, and not the single word or tense or whatever. For instance, in the discussion of negative particles Abbott (1906:207-208) states:

[2262] In John's Gospel, and perhaps in the Epistle, there are no instances of οὐ...πᾶς meaning 'not any', but πᾶς followed by οὐ (or, μή) is very frequent in both. It is partly explained by the writer's love of universal propositions, especially in connection with the Church ('all that thou hast given me,' 'every branch in me,' 'everyone that believeth').

In this section of the book, Abbott in effect does nothing more than indicate that John uses the Greek language in his Gospel. Of a real description (in the modern sense and in his own paradigm) of style, characteristics and the function of the language, there is no indication at all. It is done in this way since it was considered adequate in Abbott's methodology to merely *list* these instances in John. The question of why the author utilizes the language in this specific manner is also not addressed in any way. Although it is not fair to criticize Abbott's methodology with the insights of modern critical study, this analysis of his approach helps us to form a clear picture of what 'style' meant for Abbott and his contemporaries.

The second part of *Johannine Grammar* (Abbott:1906) approaches the description of Johannine style more closely than any of the previous sections. Here arrangement, variation and the repetition of words are discussed. It is indeed rather characteristic of John to use this type of language, but by only describing instances where it is used and discussing in *general terms* certain features such as chiasm, the possessive genitive, and so forth, no real characteristic Johannine use of language is elucidated. After all, other authors in the New Testament also use the same linguistic devices in their writings. Abbott also discusses instances where the synoptics used the same features — the real difference for him would seem to lie not so much in the simple use of certain devices but in the *content* of the passages involved, but this is no real *stylistic* distinction! To be made aware of the fact that differences do exist, is only a starting point for the study of style and not an end in itself. Without being too harsh on Abbott, it must be made clear that this type of approach is inadequate for the study of style. However, Abbott was no modern scholar and thought and wrote in the traditional way in which style was studied along these lines.

Unfortunately it would seem that this traditional type of approach, where certain stylistic devices and features are only mentioned and the function and effects thereof are not discussed at all, is still being used today — probably as a result of the neglect of specific Johannine style studies and the influence of the traditional view that the style of an author only has to do with *vocabulary* and certain unusual *syntactical* features.

Before discussing some more exponents of the traditional approach, it must be stressed that Abbott greatly influenced Johannine style studies up to this day. The two volumes by Abbott are still used widely and seem to be standard items in most of the bibliographies quoted by scholars dealing with Johannine language and style. It is for this reason that Abbott's two volumes were discussed in some detail.

As was mentioned earlier, this perception of style prevailed for most of this century in a large number of publications on the Fourth Gospel, probably as a continuation of the example set by Abbott. Even some of the most prominent Johannine scholars of recent years also deal with the question of style in the Gospel in much the same way as Abbott did, albeit not in such an extensive way.

Example 2: Raymond Brown (1982,1:xxxv-xxxvi) under the heading of 'Notable characteristics in Johannine style' mentions very shortly only six characteristics, namely inclusion, chiasm, twofold or double meaning, misunderstanding, irony and explanatory notes. It is not clear why Brown chose these characteristics in the first place or why he limited himself only to these — he never gives any reason for this. The importance of the cognition of such style characteristics is also not explained and the reader of this commentary on John is kept in the dark as to why Brown gave this information in the first place. In the commentary itself, very little information is given with regard to style. Usually the reader is referred to this limited section only. For instance, Brown (1982,1:170) on chapter 4:12 only states: 'This is a perfect example of Johannine irony see Introduction, p. cxxxvi), for the woman is unconsciously stating a truth.' The significance of this for understanding the specific passage is never indicated, and this is a serious deficiency.

Some instances and examples of characteristics of style are mentioned in the introduction, and one would assume that the selection of certain characteristics would indicate that they are important for the understanding of John. However, these characteristics or style features are not mentioned, explained or elaborated upon in the detailed commentary. For example, Brown (1982,1:xxxvi) when discussing Johannine *misunderstanding* refers the reader to John 2:19-22. But in his discussion of this section in the commentary Brown (1982,1:114-125), never again refers to this style feature, the function thereof, or why it is important to see misunderstanding as a feature of Johannine style. Examples such as this can be multiplied.

In this excellent commentary on John, it also becomes clear that the question of Johannine style is neglected, not because Brown was unaware of or deemed examination style unnecessary, but because the traditional narrow view of style necessarily limited him to mentioning only certain characteristics of style without explaining or expounding the significance thereof for the understanding of John's Gospel. This is done neither in his discussion of the characteristics of Johannine style nor in the detailed commentary. The inevitable question to be asked, is why the inclusion of the section on style was deemed necessary. This is a perfect example of how the traditional view of style can inhibit an exegete in the implementation of the results of a style analysis, and incorporating it in the whole of the discussion on the meaning and understanding of a document.

Example 3: An equally well-known and respected commentary on the Gospel of John is the one by Barrett, revised in 1978. This commentary also includes, as part of an introductory section, a few pages on the literary style of John. Barrett (1978:5-11) starts this discussion by remarking on the Greek of John: 'It is neither bad Greek nor (according to classical standards) good Greek. Solecisms are avoided; and so are all the fine and characteristic subtleties of the Greek language. In spite of the absence of these niceties the style remains not only clear but very impressive.'

This seems to be a bit different from the viewpoints of Brown and Abbott who both regarded the style of John as more polished than does Barrett. The difference in the assessment of John's style clearly lies in the different views these scholars hold regarding style. Abbott has a much more comprehensive view and regards both linguistic factors, such as the usage of different words, prepositions, syntax, and other stylistic factors such as synonyms, double meaning, metaphors, and so on as significant for style analyses. Brown (1982,1:cxv) on the other hand, concentrated more on features such as misunderstanding, irony and double meaning, while Barrett (1978:7) emphasized characteristic expressions and usages such as *parataxis*, *asyndeton*, and so on. Different as these two approaches may seem, the fact remains that all these commentaries have a narrow view of style in mind and this restricts their discussion of style in the same way as Abbott's is restricted.

But to return to Barrett: He gives some statistics on the occurrence of certain words which are frequently used by John and which occur rarely in the synoptic Gospels. Similarly, common synoptic words — absent or occurring rarely in John — are given. Why this is deemed necessary remains an open question. Barrett does not give any reasons for this — the only possible reason is that one is made aware of the fact that John's Gospel differs in vocabulary from the synoptics, but this is not surprising and nothing new, and hardly pertains to style. Barrett (1978:7) probably also sensed this deficiency as he continues: 'John's style may be more particularly studied by the examination of a number of characteristic expressions and usages.'

He then goes on to list a number of these, such as *parataxis*, *asyndeton*, usage of οὖν, ἐκεῖνος, οὐ, ἀλλά, and so forth (Barrett 1978:9-10). This is based, according to Barrett (1978:7) on Schweizer, Gogel, Howard and Ruckstuhl. But again the question arises, why he chose to select certain features above others. For instance, Schweizer (1939:87-99) mentions at least 32 characteristic stylistic features and Ruckstuhl (1951:203-205) adds some 18 more to this. Barrett does not explain why he considers the few he selected as more important than others.

Barrett also fails to indicate how knowledge of these style features can help in analyzing the Gospel. We will give a single example of this. Regarding some of these features Barrett (1978:8) argues that they are 'really significant; for example the Johannine αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐμαυτοῦ points to a fundamental element in John's Christology (see especially on 5.19)'. But when one examines the relevant section in the commentary (Barrett 1978:257-259) nothing of the significance of this 'stylistic feature' is mentioned or even vaguely linked to the discussion and interpretation of 5:19. Again the inability to show the relevance of an examination of style for the understanding of the Gospel is clearly illustrated by this.

Barrett (1978:8) also notes that 'others [*other stylistic features JEB*] have importance chiefly in the fact that, since they occur uniformly throughout the Gospel, they serve as evidence for its integrity'. Surely that is not the chief

importance of an author implementing certain stylistic features! An author wants to convey some meaning by using certain linguistic signals, and this Barrett seems to disregard. Stylistic features can indeed be used to some extent to determine integrity but to use them only for this is to grossly neglect their function in a text, especially in an *exegetical* commentary. But this type of approach to style is also part of the traditional approach where it is thought necessary only to list certain grammatical characteristics in order to grasp an author's style. In and through his argumentation one can perceive that Barrett's notion of style does not differ markedly from that of Abbott and Brown.

In a subsequent section, Barrett (1978:8-9) mentions the debate about the proposed influence of *Aramaic* in the Gospels. Also the *Greek* style (where stylistic criteria were used to prove or disprove the Aramaic influences) is mentioned. We will discuss this in more detail in a subsequent section but it can be stated here that with regard to style nothing more than a mere listing of features is given, with no mention of their relevance for the understanding of the Gospel.

We can conclude that Barrett thus also fails to give more than a rather insufficient list of alleged style characteristics of John. Although somewhat different from Abbott and Brown in presentation and structuring of these elements, Barrett's approach to style can also be classified together with these, as all three of them seem to regard the identification of certain style characteristics in a text as sufficient for describing style. Valuable as this may be, more is definitely needed as 'peculiar uses of pronouns, conjunctions, negatives, prepositions, particles, prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause, and so on, seem to be far more related to the grammar of an author than to style' (Louw 1986:5).

When style is seen in the perspective of the authors mentioned above, a broader approach is automatically ruled out and cannot be implemented. Thus Abbott, Brown and Barrett, although giving useful information, adhere to the traditional approach to style, which in the light of later developments definitely is too restrictive and must be supplemented by more recent insights. This is so because an author's choice from among the various possibilities of expression offered by the language, the way in which his information is presented, arguments, and structure of the total discourse also pertains to style. Furthermore, in this traditional approach, it is only possible to list a *few* eclectically chosen so-called style characteristics and usages, which necessarily limits the presentation to a large extent. However, this type of approach actually necessitates the inclusion of *all* grammatical and syntactical aspects, together with the vocabulary employed by the author, which is of course impossible. This means that the writers have to be selective in what they present, and can never even attempt to give a detailed description of these factors.

Example 4: Nigel Turner (1976:64-79), in the fourth volume of *A grammar of New Testament Greek*, deals in the fifth chapter specifically with the style of John. He stresses the semitic influences on the text of the Gospel, and follows the proposal of multiple sources underlying the text. In his discussion of the sources, it becomes clear that he accepts the views of Bultmann (1957), Ruckstuhl (1951), and others with regard to their concepts of style, which is the traditional, limited approach to style. Turner (1976:67-74) then discusses 'Septuagint influences', 'other Hebraisms', 'Aramaisms', and 'Semitisms'. These influences, of which he gives a few examples, without stating why he chose these specifically from the multitude of so-called stylistic influences, deals basically with syntax, grammar, word order, and fixed expressions. After dealing with these aspects, Turner (1976:74-77) turns to the following: 'Johannine clause order', 'use of particles', 'use of prepositions', 'the limited vocabulary', and (incredibly!) 'pointless variety in style'. From this it is clear what style is for Turner — nothing but grammatical and syntactical variations. He never attempts to indicate why a specific clause, word or construction is used or omitted, he works eclectically in choosing examples, and despite the late date of this volume (1976) there is no attempt to introduce new concepts of style in the whole discussion. Even well-established literary devices such as irony, *epanalepsis*, misunderstanding, and so on are never mentioned here. This is due to his perception of style, which cannot accommodate these other aspects.

Another good example of Turner's limited perception of style is his paragraph 'pointless variety in style'. This leaves the impression that the Fourth Gospel is prone to a pointless interchanging of particles, tenses, constructions, and so on. In some instances, it is indeed the case that John uses synonyms to avoid monotony, but even then it can still hardly be called pointless, and it serves a specific rhetorical aim! Some of Turner's other observations regarding 'pointless' variations, such using more than one word for 'love', 'send', 'ask', and so on, as well as changes in tense, can be shown to be of considerable significance, and not pointless at all. Turner (1976:77-78) concludes that:

John's language throughout is characteristic of Jewish Greek, syntactically very simple, dignified but without the flexibility of the secular language, pointlessly varied in syntax and vocabulary, but without the solecisms and without the energy of Revelation. It moves within well-defined Semitic limits of style and vocabulary.

From these remarks by Turner (1976) it is clear that during the middle nineteen seventies of this century the very narrow and restricted view of style has not changed since the days of Abbott. Also see the scorching review of Turner (1976) by Nieting (1977:591-592) who concludes that 'those who do research in the language of the bible [*sic*] ought to base their work on modern post-Saussurean linguistics. Turner has not done this. His perception of style is through and through nineteenth century'. Silva (1980:217) and Louw (1986:5) is also extremely critical about Turner's work. However, even more significant

than the criticism against Turner's work, is the fact that it was welcomed by many scholars and regarded as 'the soundest we have in NT grammatical literature' (Gignac 1977:167; see also Hughes' 1976-77:152-155 positive evaluation of Turner). The fact that many New Testament scholars were accepting Turner's notions on style without reserve, is also an indication of a general perception of style in New Testament scholarship towards the end of the 1970s.

To conclude our observations regarding the traditional approach: The narrow and restricted view of style discussed above is very widespread and in fact most studies and commentaries on the Fourth Gospel which include some remarks on style tend to follow this type of approach. This is however not unique to Johannine style studies as can be seen from Dawsey's (1989:48-66) perception of what style is in Luke-Acts.

In the following sections we will be discussing some other approaches, but it must be kept in mind that basically all these can also be classified as 'traditional' in the sense that they similarly hold the view that style pertains only to figures of speech, vocabulary, sentence structure and grammatical peculiarities. In this sense even studies done much later than Abbott's (1905, 1906) do not represent any real progress in Johannine style studies. The following studies are classified differently from the above because they differ with regard to presentation and purpose, although the same perception of style is also present here. Whereas the works mentioned previously were concerned with Johannine style as such, the following discussion will attempt to show that the study of style was implemented for secondary purposes or that only single aspects of style were the object of the research. Thus, the way in which these authors present and achieve their aims will afford us the opportunity of determining what their perception of style is.

2.2 Johannine style studies for secondary purposes

2.2.1. Style and sources

One of the major areas of interest in twentieth century Johannine studies centers around *source criticism* of the Fourth Gospel. In this part of the study we will concentrate only on the most influential source theories of recent years, as these theories proved to be particularly important for the question of style. It is important for our present study because all these theories include, as part of their hypotheses, a section on style.

Howard (1955:297-305) gives a brief summary of the major older source proposals. For a summary of the more recent themes and exponents of Johannine source criticism Kysar (1975:13-37; 1983:3-5), Barrett (1978:15-21), Teeple (1974:30-51), and Smith (1984:37-44) can be consulted. The discussion below will only touch upon source criticism where it takes stylistic criteria into

consideration to prove or disprove certain conclusions of the source-redaction critical method. We can agree with Kysar (1975:14) that 'a decisive turning point in source-redaction criticism was the appearance of Rudolf Bultmann's monumental commentary on the Fourth Gospel'.

In this commentary Bultmann ([1941] 1957) argued very convincingly for the existence of sources behind the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann (1957:162) proposed to restore the original order of the text of the Gospel which was disturbed at a very early date and later rearranged by a redactor to its present form. By means of rearranging the text, Bultmann tried to clear up the difficulties which arose from the earlier displacements and dislocations. There are also other difficulties in the text which centers around the literary unity of the text. To solve this problem Bultmann constructed his source theory in which he proposed that the evangelist used certain earlier written sources and wove them together without being able to remove the traces of it adequately. Smith (1965:xiv) explains: 'Thus, by a theory involving written sources, textual displacement, and redaction, Bultmann resolves the literary and related problems of the Fourth Gospel.'

We will give only a very short summary of Bultmann's source theory here, since our primary aim is not to discuss the source theories as such, but to discover what the authors perceived style to be. We can make this discovery only by understanding what role style played in their theories. Bultmann identifies five principal literary strata in the Fourth Gospel:

- (i) A *Vorlage* in the prologue with a poetic structure, gnostic mythological motifs and Semitisms. This source he calls the *Offenbarungsreden* (Bultmann 1957:164).
- (ii) Bultmann also identifies a Semeia-source or sign-source from which the evangelist had drawn his miracle stories (Bultmann 1957:78).
- (iii) The Johannine passion narrative is also said to be drawn from a written source (Bultmann 1957:489).
- (iv) At a later stage the redactor who is responsible for the Gospel in its present form, also introduced some material; for instance, chapter 21; 6:51b-58; 5:28ff; 12:48 and 19:34b,35 (Bultmann 1957:543-545.)
- (v) The evangelist himself also, according to Bultmann, contributed to the Fourth Gospel. He composed certain sections himself and wove the sources he used into a harmonious whole. He wrote in Greek.

To arrive at these conclusions it is, according to Bultmann, necessary to distinguish the work of the evangelist from that of the sources. By analyzing the language of the Gospel text, he tries to distinguish the hand of the evangelist. Bultmann (1957:342) argues that although the Gospel leaves an impression of unity in its speech, it could be ascribed to the evangelist's thorough editing. However, there are, according to Bultmann, definite differences between the

speech of different sections, such as the narrative parts and the discourses. This is an indication that different sources can indeed be separated from the later editing by the evangelist.

To distinguish the style of the evangelist, Bultmann identified certain characteristics of style and speech which seem to be peculiar to the evangelist and which clearly separates the work of the evangelist from the sources. Smith (1965:9-11) compiled a very useful list of these criteria Bultmann applied — useful in the sense that Bultmann *himself* never systematically and explicitly discusses these criteria. It is, however implicit everywhere in his commentary. Smith (1965:9) states that these characteristics can be classified as *lexical*, *stylistic* and *syntactical*. Only a few examples of his classification (Smith 1965:9) are necessary to illustrate this:

The specific and general stylistic characteristics of the evangelist most frequently cited by Bultmann include the following... (1) prosaic style (1:6-8), (2) Old Testament and Rabbinic modes of expression and Semitisms in general, (3) the frequent use of the exegetical ὡς-phrase explicating a demonstrative... (4) the exegetical ὡς-phrase itself... (5) stylized statements of definition... and identification... (6) the antithetical construction with a positive statement preceded by its negative counterpart.

It must be noted that these characteristics are by no means exhaustive. Smith (1965:11) only compiled the 'most important' ones, but the rest used by Bultmann are of the same type. They just occur less frequently. In addition to this, certain characteristic literary techniques and expressions are also identified, for instance, the motif of misunderstanding, questions introduced to reproach Jesus' dialogue partners, reverting to a subject, and summary assertions. Bultmann, in addition to these so-called stylistic criteria, also used contextual evidence and theological motifs to distinguish the work of the evangelist from the sources.

In identifying and delineating the different sources, Bultmann thus employs certain stylistic criteria, together with other considerations. Regarding the *Offenbarungsreden*-source, in addition to theological and *Religionsgeschichtliche* criteria, Bultmann also used stylistic criteria in the delineation of the source. The discourses in the *Offenbarungsreden* have a marked rhythmic, poetic style which contrasts with the prosaic style of the evangelist. This poetic style, Bultmann (1957:2-3) believes to be typical of semitic poetry, especially in the prologue. Bultmann also notes a number of other characteristics of this source as Smith (1965:21) indicates: 'Semitisms... ἐγώ εἰμι sayings... superfluous third line after a double verse marking the end of a discourse... πᾶς with the participle as the subject of a clause... or sometimes replaced by a relative clause or εἰς-phrase as in 4:14.'

These characteristics and others such as the fact that the *Offenbarungsreden* are nearly always put into the mouth of Jesus (Bultmann 1957:93), together with the re-arrangement of the text makes for a strong case for this proposed source.

Smith (1965:22) sums up Bultmann's proposals regarding the delineation of both the *Offenbarungsreden* and the work of the evangelist.

Bultmann identifies literary strata so that his criteria for identifying one become negative criteria for the other. The occurrence of a number of the stylistic characteristics of the evangelist in a passage indicates that the passage in question does not stem from any of the sources, unless characteristics of the source also appear. In such cases it usually becomes necessary to make separations within the passage, since the evangelist has evidently reworked, expanded, or annotated his source, imparting to it traces of his own style.

Bultmann follows the same procedure for identifying the *Semeia*-source. After utilizing general contextual evidence, stylistic features of the *Semeia*-source are identified. According to Bultmann (1957:78), this source was written in Greek with semitising features, as well as certain non-Greek expressions and constructions. Here, however, Bultmann (1957:301) admits that although the style of the *Semeia*-source can clearly be identified, the style characteristics of this source and the evangelist's cannot be differentiated clearly in this case.

Regarding the *Passion* source, Bultmann (1957:491-492) argues that the style is also semitising Greek and compiles an extensive list of features, but he does not separate the characteristics of this source from that of the evangelist. Here the conclusion is clearly that the stylistic criteria do not give decisive evidence for source criticism.

For identifying and differentiating other sources and traditions, Bultmann usually uses style criteria to aid the contextual and theological considerations in determining the extent or boundaries of a tradition or source. For instance, regarding the story of the foot washing and the interpretation of this story, John 13:4,5,12-29 is considered a late *apothegma* — and stylistic evidence is used to support this (Bultmann 1957:351-352).

From the above discussion it should be clear what Bultmann's interest in the style of John's Gospel is. Clearly he did not analyze the style in order to discover something of the message of the Gospel, but used stylistic criteria only to prove that the author of the Fourth Gospel used sources that can be distinguished in the text as we have it. The criteria he used and termed *stylistic* (*sprachlich und stilistisch*) are nothing more than the identification of certain characteristic features of syntax, vocabulary and usage. Even the mentioning of other characteristic literary techniques or expressions is hardly more than a mere mentioning of their presence. From the way in which Bultmann treated these so-called style characteristics, it is clear that he held the same view as did Abbott and others that style only deals with syntax, vocabulary and some obvious literary techniques. Since the publication of Bultmann's first proposals, there have been serious attacks on his source theory by scholars such as inter alia Jeremias (1941:33-46), Menoud (1947:17-21), Käsemann (1942:182-201), and Ruckstuhl (1951). However, the fact remains that from what one can learn

about Bultmann's views on the literary style of John as representative of his time, it is clear that the rather restricted perception of what style analysis comprises, had not undergone any changes or development since the beginning of the century. The basic views on style remained static.

Following Bultmann's lead, there appeared quite a number of studies tracing different sources in John's Gospel. The major investigations were those done by Fortna (1970), Nicol (1972a) and Teeple (1974), all of which worked along basically the same lines. An earlier study by H Becker (1956) follows a slightly different approach and is therefore discussed separately. What is of significance for the present study is that each of these studies employ as part of their criteria for distinguishing sources, stylistic criteria.

Fortna's work focused basically on the identification of the signs source and is a reaction to the theses by Schweizer (1939) and Ruckstuhl (1951) on the unity of the Gospel. Fortna (1970) shifted the importance of stylistic criteria to a supportive and secondary place for source isolation. Thus in his work, we find that stylistic criteria receive considerably less attention, than was the case with Bultmann. This is due to the fact that 'stylistic data, by themselves cannot serve as the basis for reconstruction since, as in the case of ideological ones, we cannot know in advance which characteristics are Johannine and which pre-Johannine' (Fortna 1970:18).

The program Fortna follows is to try to establish the text of the source by firstly applying contextual criteria and then by confirming the results of this contextual testing with the application of ideological and stylistic criteria. The *stylistic criteria* which Fortna applies are of the same type as those which Bultmann (1957) and Ruckstuhl (1951) identified, that is, characteristic and peculiar syntax, vocabulary, usage of particles, and so forth. Again the study of style here is only limited to what Fortna considered necessary to characterize the *Semeia*-source. Furthermore, this characterization by means of these so-called stylistic criteria, is only part of the picture, as Fortna considers the application of other criteria as more important for his purpose.

Fortna's view of style is not adequate and even in his own paradigm is suspect, as he never explains why he chose certain stylistic features above others. It therefore seems that Freed and Hunt (1975:564) rightly criticize Fortna for not also using features such as variations in language and thought, of which Fortna definitely was aware as he quotes the article by Freed (1964:167-197) on this, when he discusses stylistic criteria, and is criticized by Freed and Hunt (1975:564): 'Although considerations of literary style are, of course, an essential part of Fortna's method, he ignores completely stylistic variations of the kind discussed by Freed.'

Fortna did not by any means include a comprehensive list of a stylistic features. In fact, he used only a very limited number of characteristics without substantiating his choices. All these characteristics were basically the same as those which were already identified in the earlier research by Schweizer (1939)

and Ruckstuhl (1951). Although Fortna presented something new methodologically speaking in his examination of the underlying sources of the Fourth Gospel, no real or substantial progress was made in the treatment of stylistics pertaining to the Gospel. He used the same, well-known and limited features. This indicates that at the time when Fortna wrote (1970), no real advances had been made in the way in which style was perceived, and that the traditional narrow views regarding the style of John's Gospel, were still being upheld.

In a way very similar to that of Fortna, Nicol (1972a) tried to prove the existence of a signs source. The criteria Nicol applies to establish the source are *form*, *style*, *aporias* and *ideological tensions*. Regarding the alleged Johannine characteristics, Nicol adds to the list of style characteristics Ruckstuhl (1951) identified, some thirty-two more. These characteristics, together with ideological criteria, Nicol presents as supporting evidence for the separation of sources. Nicol (1972a:25) remarks on his expansion of style characteristics: 'Now that we have more characteristics, it can even without calculations be seen in a quick review of the table that the Johannine characteristics are evenly distributed in the Gospel, with the exception of some short Synoptic-like pericopes, mostly miracle stories.'

Thus Nicol's contention is that there is stylistic evidence for the separation of these miracle stories from the rest of the Gospel. Again, as was the case with Fortna, the style characteristics identified and implemented in Nicol's thesis are only of a specific type: those dealing with peculiar phrases, constructions, syntax and so forth. Remarkable in the list of additions which Nicol (1972a:23-24) gives, are numbers 63, 68 and 76. These are, respectively, 'the typical misunderstandings based on dualism', 'chiasm', and 'remarkable repetitions'. It is remarkable to find these grouped together with characteristics such as *ei-irrealis*, 'the genitive before article and noun', '*casus pendens*', and so on. The former three 'characteristics' are definitely and clearly not of the same nature as the others. The latter are *grammatical* features, while the former have to do with *diction*. Yet Nicol presents them all as if they are exactly of the same type. This indicates that Nicol has no clear and differentiated view of style and merely follows the existing trends in which style is thought to be the compilation of a few characteristic expressions and usages. It can also be questioned as to whether Nicol (and indeed his predecessors) in fact identified characteristic Johannine features in the examples they cited. For instance: Are chiasm, word separation, *ei-irrealis* and so on, really characteristic of John, or do they also occur in other texts of the New Testament? In the same vein one can pose the question regarding the evangelist himself and the proposed sources: Are they really peculiar to the evangelist, or do they just occur more frequently in the rest of John than they do in the miracle stories? The question indeed arises: Does this approach to style which Bultmann, Fortna and Nicol and others before them follow, really allow for a comprehensive understanding of style, or is it just representative of a much older and more rigoristic way of dealing with the style

of a specific author? It seems that because of the scope of the studies mentioned above, it was not necessary to study the style of John more comprehensively, as the few characteristics traditionally identified as typically Johannine were adequate for the purpose for which they were required.

Following Fortna and Nicol, Teeple (1974) also published a monograph on sources in the Fourth Gospel. Teeple's work is much more ambitious than that of his predecessors, since his solution to the problem of the origin of the Fourth Gospel involves a four-source proposal. These four sources, which Teeple (1974:142-143) confidently identifies, are an S-source (a narrative document dealing with signs); a G-source (a semi-gnostic discourse source); an E-source (the evangelist's own work); and an R-source (the work of a redactor in the second century. To detect these various sources Teeple (1974:118-119) leans heavily on stylistic criteria in combination with other criteria, and explains the differences in his method from that of the Schweizer-Ruckstuhl method:

Stylistic characteristics are valid criteria.... Style should not be employed exclusively, but in conjunction with other significant aspects such as literary structure... vocabulary, and thought content.... If we assign to one writer all occurrences of a term or a syntactical feature, when actually that stylistic trait was used by two or three writers in the gospel, we consequently assign too much to one writer.... The traits that occur the most frequently naturally tend to be those used by several writers, and hence are least valuable in detecting the work of an individual writer.

For Teeple himself, it is more significant to study the style characteristics which appear less frequently, since they signal the presence of individual sources. The *stylistic* variations in the Gospel on which Teeple's proposal leans heavily, are in particular of a *syntactic* nature. He also (in an appendix), demonstrates these syntactical variations between the four proposed sources. Syntax, then, is for Teeple 'the most important clue to source detection' (Kysar 1975:19). 'Syntax' is for Teeple very close to 'style' but he also acknowledges and utilizes other characteristics of the writers of the various sources such as the tendency to restate passages, logical inconsistencies, vocabulary, figurative speech and so on. This is, however, done on a much more limited scale and is considered *subsidiary* to the features of syntax.

This rather bold and daring proposal of Teeple's, rests on his specific view of style, of which syntax is the major constituent. Although Teeple's approach to the origins of the Gospel is a bit more ambitious than those of Fortna and Nicol, his approach to style in fact differs very little from theirs. Teeple's criticism directed against the Schweizer-Ruckstuhl method, which according to him, assigned too much to a single writer on the grounds of style criteria, (which Fortna and Nicol used) did not influence him to try and establish a broader and more substantial set of style criteria. The only difference between Teeple and Fortna/Nicol is the way in which the already identified style criteria are used. The view of what style in fact is, is no different. Basically it is the same static

and descriptive approach where (in Teeple's case) syntax is linked to style and used in order to attain same goal. This work of Teeple's underlines the fact that a comprehensive perception of style in the Fourth Gospel was still completely lacking in the early seventies, and that, by the mere application of style characteristics on a limited scale in order to prove sources, very little of the literary style of an author can actually be determined.

The use of *style characteristics* in determining *sources* in John has possibly evoked the most serious objections. J Becker (1969-70:130-148) argues strongly against stylistic criteria as a decisive way of separating source and redaction. According to J Becker (1969-70:132-133) the *aporias* in the Gospel cannot be solved by style statistics and that at most it can be said that sources and redaction share the same community. Kysar (1975:23) neatly sums up the distinction between J Becker and his predecessors in that J Becker in conceding the stylistic unity of John, discards the use of style as a criterion, while his predecessors tried to defend the use of style criteria.

Following the objections of J Becker, Kysar (1975:35) himself voices serious objections against the use of style criteria for the determination of sources, but it is clear from his argument that he himself also accepts these criteria as valid *stylistic* criteria, even though they are of a grammatical and syntactical nature: 'The use of style characteristics is perhaps the most debatable and dangerous of the various criteria employed by these scholars... the use of style characteristics tends to become circular, that is, they are used to separate the source materials and then to verify the integrity of the proposed source.' Perhaps these rather unconvincing results of the use of style criteria mentioned by Kysar, are a result of the nature of the characteristics termed *style characteristics*. As was mentioned earlier, the traditional approach to style adopted by these scholars unfortunately limited them in their reasoning so that the results obtained, were out of necessity too limited. They did not describe the style of a writer or source comprehensively enough and thus proved inconclusive.

A slightly different approach to sources in the Fourth Gospel is found in the work of Heinz Becker, published posthumously by Bultmann in 1956. H Becker, a student of Bultmann, contends that behind the discourse material in the Gospel lies a source or sources, which can be described as *Offenbarungsreden*, and of gnostic origin. His first task is to establish the form of the *Offenbarungsreden*. For this he examines texts from the Mandaen writings, and based on these findings, try to reconstruct an archetype of the *Offenbarungsreden*. An example of this is as follows:

*Ich bin der Offenbarer, der vom Himmel herabgekommen ist.
Ich bin von Gott, ihr seid von der Welt.
Gott ist Licht,
die Welt ist Finsternis.
Ich verkündige euch die Erlösung aus der Welt. Verlasst die Finsternis,
nahet euch zum Licht.*

*Lasst ab von den Werken der Welt
und wirkt die Werke Gottes.
Ich bin der von Gott gesandte Helfer.
Wer auf mich hört, wird das Licht schauen;
wer nicht auf mich hört, wird in die Finsternis sinken.*

(Becker, H 1956:57)

From this example, where the important correlating factor is the *structure* of the archetype and his discussion of *Der Stil der Offenbarungsrede* (Becker, H 1956:53-59) it is clear that Becker applies different style criteria from those which Fortna, Nicol and Teeple apply. For him, style seems to be equivalent to *structure* and *patterns of thought*. The structure of the *Offenbarungsrede* and the *Denkweise* are the two things Becker regards as stylistically significant and proceeds to test the Johannine discourses against this background. He recovers a threefold *form* for the *Offenbarungsrede*, namely *Selbstpredikation*, *Situationsangabe*, and *Krisenspruch*. In addition to these elements, one of the most important characteristics of the *Offenbarungsreden* is the 'spiralige Entwicklung von Gedanken an Hand der drei für die Offenbarungsrede Konstitutiven Elemente' (Becker, H 1956:56). Furthermore Becker contends that the style of the *Offenbarungsreden* can be typified as both dualistic and eschatological.

What emerges clearly from the above is that for H Becker style is limited to *thought patterns* and certain *structural elements*, which indeed is a part of the style of an author. But it must be kept in mind that by only taking these two aspects of style into consideration, a considerable limitation is placed on the results. Although H Becker employed other style features, he also, like his predecessors, also exhibited too narrow a view of style. This has the result that his findings on style are only *partially* acceptable because a *total* view of the style of the *Offenbarungsreden* is lacking. It must be stressed that the above would indicate that a comprehensive approach to Johannine style had not begun to emerge in Becker's day, and that the notion of style was perceived differently even by scholars from the same school such as Bultmann and Becker. This is of course so because Becker has a *Religionsgeschichtliche* aim, where his primary object is not to discuss style as such, but to find and locate the origin of the discourses in the religious *Umwelt*.

H Becker was, of course, not the first to try and establish the origin of the discourses. He notes the discovery of a *Soteriologisches Redetypus* by Norden (1913) and Wetter (1916) but elaborates more on the work of Schweizer (1939) and Kundsinn (1939). However, all these scholars used, for their analyses of Johannine style, grammatical and syntactical features of the sort which Bultmann, Fortna, Nicol and Teeple used. Becker, however, because of his *Religionsgeschichtliche* aims, differs somewhat from them in his approach to style.

To conclude this section: It should be noted that examples where criteria of style were introduced to establish the source or sources behind the Fourth Gospel can be multiplied, but as was stated initially, the aim of this section is merely to give an indication of the way in which the style of John's Gospel received attention and to establish through that how the style of the Gospel was perceived.

2.2.2 Style and the unity of the Gospel

Certainly the two most comprehensive studies which argue strongly for the literary unity of John's Gospel were the two monographs published by Schweizer (1939) and Ruckstuhl (1951). Although they were not the first to postulate Johannine literary unity, they are quite significant because of their marked influence and the great reaction to them in this century. For a survey of side theories concerning the unity of the Gospel, the work of Schweizer (1939:82-87) and Ruckstuhl (1951:1-19) can be consulted. Inevitably, style criteria were introduced to assist in proving the unity of the Gospel. The rationale was that when two or more of these characteristics were present in a Johannine passage whose literary unity was clear, it could be assumed that any other 'passage containing either of them came from the same author' (Ruckstuhl 1977:125).

Schweizer (1939) collected thirty-three characteristic features of Johannine style. Regarding these characteristics and their significance for the establishing of the unity of the Gospel, Schweizer (1939:87-88) argues that there are characteristics which occur 'ausschliesslich oder fast ausschliesslich' in the Gospel. If such rare usages occur it is hardly possible they could stem from a multitude of authors. If such characteristics only occur in specific parts, then it is most probable that this represents a source. Schweizer (1939:88) continues:

4. Falls dies nicht der Fall ist, ist damit nicht beweisen, dass restlose Einheitlichkeit vorliegt. Es ist aber höchst wahrscheinlich gemacht, dass mindestens die Einheit am Ende liegt, dass also der endgültige Verfasser entweder alles selbst formuliert oder dann vorliegende Quellen inbearbeitet hat.... 6. Es ist dabei denkbar, dass dieser endgültige Verfasser (a) seine Vorlage mit dem eigenen Stil durchdringt (b) ihre Eigentümlichkeiten umgekehrt in seinen Stil aufnimmt.

From these observations, one can deduce what the nature of Johannine peculiarities and style consists of. Together with Schweizer's (1939:88-96) discussion of the above-mentioned thirty three style characteristics, which basically consist of the identification of certain words phrases, constructions and other grammatical and syntactical idiosyncrasies, a clearer picture begins to emerge of what style is to his mind.

In 1951 Ruckstuhl's dissertation on the literary unity of the Gospel was published. He expanded Schweizer's thirty-three characteristics to fifty by taking

certain suggestions by Jeremias and Menoud into consideration (see Ruckstuhl 1951:197-198). On the grounds of the occurrences of these fifty characteristics Ruckstuhl then substantiates the claim of the unity of the Gospel. Ruckstuhl also introduced an explicit distinction between style *characteristics* and style *features* which was implicit in Schweizer's approach.

In addition to this distinction, Ruckstuhl also divided the list of fifty characteristics into three groups of diminishing importance. Despite these modifications introduced by Ruckstuhl, there was basically no difference between the type of characteristics which he and Schweizer identified. They are all examples of the usage of certain words, expressions, syntax and vocabulary which seem to be specifically Johannine. As was mentioned earlier in connection with Fortna and Nicol's use of style characteristics (which as we mentioned, is dependent on Schweizer-Ruckstuhl), the characteristics identified are all on the same level and present a very narrow view of style, where style characteristics is considered equal to *sprachlich Ungewohntes*. Ruckstuhl (1977:127) states regarding these style characteristics which he identified in 1951: 'With respect to the list of Johannine style characteristics, perhaps all critics did not realize its nature, intention and potential applicability. It was not designed to include all the marks and features of Jn.... Moreover, as was previously shown, our list was always intended to face the problem of style imitation and imitability.'

This could perhaps be interpreted that Ruckstuhl holds a much more elaborate and substantial view of style. It is, however, clear from his remarks (1977:127-129) that his meaning in actual fact is that there are some more characteristics *of the same type* in John not mentioned in his list of fifty. In the end it can be said that both Schweizer and Ruckstuhl also hold the traditional views concerning style which only concentrate on grammar, syntax and vocabulary to describe an author's style.

Furthermore the critique of Hirsch (1950-51) and Haenchen (1955) on certain of the characteristics of the Schweizer-Ruckstuhl method should not be taken so lightly as does Ruckstuhl (1977:127). It can indeed be asked whether some of the style characteristics are not merely examples of Hellenistic idioms and diction? The problem regarding this becomes even more acute because of the admittance by Ruckstuhl (1977:128) himself that 'Neither Schweizer nor I were able to undertake the laborious task of compiling a comparison with all Koine documents and witnesses dating from the turn of the first century.' This is indeed a serious deficiency in the method, for how can it be contended that something is specifically Johannine if it is compared only to approximately twenty writings from the first century? Furthermore the inadequacies of a too narrow or traditional view of style are clearly illustrated here. By only using *some* of the vocabulary and *some* of the trends in syntax and word usage which *seem* (without any clear proof) to be Johannine it is virtually impossible to determine an author's style. A more expanded and inclusive approach to style,

where other factors like the structure and perhaps even the function of a text, the way in which an author manipulates his audience, and so on, are also taken into consideration, could perhaps result in more reliable and sound observations to style. The need to compare the Johannine material to *all* other Koine documents would then be far less pressing, since in a more comprehensive approach to style syntax and diction would only be a small part of the total approach to style.

After Ruckstuhl there appeared a number of studies which also argued for the literary unity of the Gospel. Ridderbos (1966:188) also concluded on the grounds of a number of characteristics that these 'are scattered over the whole Gospel with such frequency and evenness that in general the literary unity can no longer be called into question'. The type of style characteristics he refers to are, however, no different from those identified by Schweizer and Ruckstuhl.

A slightly different type of style characteristic was identified and used by Freed (1964:167-197). He was also interested in the variations in both *language* and *thought* of John. He concludes:

I have, of course, assumed the unity of authorship. The variations are so numerous and of so many kinds, and so apparent throughout the Gospel, that they could hardly be due to different sources or to different hands.... Is the Gospel as we now have it, the result of an artistic zeal for variation or the result of mere accident? Could it be that the writer was more concerned with the art of sheer variation than with historical accuracy and theological consistency?

(Freed 1964:196-197)

A few years later in 1975, Freed and Hunt published an article following the work of Fortna and Nicol in which the possibility of a source or sources in John's Gospel is granted. Here Freed and Hunt suggest that Fortna should have taken into account, in addition to his style characteristics, the criterion of variation, which can assist in proving a particular source. Although the article by Freed and Hunt gives some valuable insight into the fact that stylistic variations are an important aspect of Johannine style, this criterion also, like the others, needs to be incorporated into a more comprehensive whole.

To conclude this section: It is very much obvious that the traditional approach was, since the days of Abbott, considered valid for scholars suggesting the unity of the Gospel of John. The style criteria implemented to establish the unity of the Gospel were all of the same kind. Even the approach of Freed which seemed slightly different, in fact, is a continuation of the material found in Abbott, albeit a bit more extensive — as is clearly evident from remarks made by Freed (1964:169) when he states that 'the work of Abbott can be greatly supplemented at almost every point. For example, he mentions the verb of seeing is thrice varied in 1:32-34. But he does not mention that the writer uses three different aorist forms of the verb'. The work of the above-mentioned

scholars reflect what style was considered to consist of. It seems that there was indeed very little alteration in the perception of what Johannine style was, from the days of Abbott to Freed and later. It can of course be argued that this is perhaps due to the fact that it was never the intention of these authors to discuss the style of John *per se*. They were interested in the unity of the Gospel, and the study of style merely contributed to this main endeavor. But the fact remains that their methodology and remarks are indicative of their perception of style as such.

2.2.3 Style and the Aramaic origin of the Gospel

The question of Aramaic influence upon the language and style of John is one of long standing. During the nineteenth century, voices were continually raised claiming that the Greek of the Fourth Gospel was very much Semitic. Burney (1922:2-3) provides useful details on the older theories. In our analysis of the development of the Aramaic question we have broadly followed the lines indicated in the analysis of Schuyler Brown (1964).

Early in this century, Schlatter (1902) demonstrated that the language of the Fourth Gospel abounds with semitic idioms by paralleling verses in John with material in the New Hebrew of Mechilta, Sifre and Rabbinic material such as the Mishna, Targums and Midrashim. He was followed by Ball (1909) who, on the grounds of some peculiarities in the language of John, argued for a written Aramaic original. Burney (1922:2) admitted that this short article prompted him to take up the study of Aramaisms in John, and this resulted in a very extensive and comprehensive argument for an Aramaic original of John, influencing research to this day.

In his work Burney made a clear distinction between an *Aramaism* (any grammatical or syntactical construction which is ordinary in Aramaic but abnormal in Greek), a *Hebraism* (a construction which is abnormal in Greek but ordinary in Hebrew) and a *Semitism* (a construction found in both Hebrew and Aramaic but peculiar to Greek). According to Burney (1922:17-18), the Gospel of John contains no Hebraisms, but only Aramaisms and Semitisms. This would exclude the possibility that the style of the Septuagint which is semitising, was deliberately imitated. Burney furthermore postulated that the author/translator of the Greek of the Gospel mistranslated certain Aramaic originals, for example the largest source of mistranslations is thought to be the particle *δέ*. In this way Burney tries to demonstrate that the constructions in the Fourth Gospel are unidiomatic Greek. In 1923 Montgomery arrived at a similar conclusion, but his thesis does not demand a written Aramaic original. His main focus is also on Aramaic constructions as a point of departure.

Torrey (1923:331) supports the views held by Burney but rejects the mistranslations for which Burney argues. However, he supplies quite a number of his own and suggests the Aramaic nature of an additional number of

constructions. Other scholars rejected Burney's theory of an Aramaic original, but favor the idea that the author of the Fourth Gospel had an oral Aramaic source for the words of Jesus. Thus the author composed in Greek, translating mentally the Aramaic words, sentences and phrases. Perhaps the most well known exponents of this theory subsequent to Burney, are Allis (1928:531-572), Driver (1923:7-9) and Howard (1929:483-484). Building on these reviews, Burrows (1930:15-139) classified and evaluated the alleged Aramaisms identified so far. Although he mentions quite a number of apparent Semitisms which also occur in Greek, on the whole he agrees with the arguments for a written Aramaic original.

In 1933 Torrey again published a monograph called *The Four Gospels* where he gives a translation of the hypothetical original Aramaic Gospels. Regarding the Fourth Gospel, Torrey contends that only the last chapter was written in Greek and that syntactical anomalies in the Greek of the Gospel can be explained only by an overly literal translation. This work was followed by another monograph in 1936 in which he, on the grounds of the alleged Aramaic originals, dates the four Gospels not later than AD 50 and contends that they were not written outside Palestine. These rather incautious and radical conclusions were rejected, but his theories regarding the Aramaisms in the Fourth Gospel are still considered useful by scholars who contend for an Aramaic source.

Ten years later, Black (1946) published a monograph on Aramaic influences on the Four Gospels and Acts. He also subscribes to the theory of an Aramaic sayings source, but suggests that instead of 'translation' one should speak of 'interpretation' and is thus much more careful in his formulation of a theory. However, he agrees that mistranslations are indeed indicative of an Aramaic original. He also calls attention to the fact that frequently assonance, alliteration and paronomasia in Aramaic can be detected in the discourses of Jesus when these are translated back into the Aramaic. Black received favorable reviews of his book (see inter alia Rowley 1947, Manson 1947, Taylor 1946-47) — especially since his cautious and well balanced viewpoints were in stark contrast to those of some of his predecessors. Boismard (1958) also presupposes an Aramaic source by using a suggestion made by Black to the effect that textual variants could provide some evidence to establish a source. His biggest contribution lies in the fact that he extended his scope from Greek textual variants to the versions found in the Greek Fathers.

These lines of study are still being pursued today, although much more nuanced since the thesis by Black. It is granted that the Gospel was composed in Greek, but it is not denied that there existed something like Black's oral logia-source, perhaps in Aramaic. Bonsirven (1949) also argued along the same lines and stressed that Semitic concepts and phrases are embedded in idiomatic Greek, giving evidence that the evangelist 'meditated' upon the words of Jesus.

Perhaps these more nuanced and less radical viewpoints of the so-called

Aramaic school are due to the fact that, right from the beginning, voices were raised against the very radical statements that completely excluded a Greek composition of the Gospel. For instance, Deissmann (1907), while not denying Aramaisms in the Gospels, stressed the colloquial character of the Greek of the Fourth Gospel (see also Silva 1980). Reacting to Burney, Colwell (1931) denied *any* Aramaic influence in John's Gospel and showed, by means of a detailed analysis of Burney's work, that certain constructions and translations posed by Burney are indeed usual Greek usage. Colwell (1931:130-131) severely criticizes the scholars proposing an Aramaic original on *two* counts. In the first place he judges their *method* to be 'unsound' because '(1) they use no adequate control; (2) they are inaccurate and inconsistent; (3) they point to the cumulative force of a list of Aramaisms of the weakest sort'. Secondly, their results are also doubtful and not convincing because of three reasons: '(1) they do not pick the same Aramaisms when they work independently; (2) they reject each other's mistranslations; (3) the vast majority (about 90 per cent) of their Aramaisms have been shown by this study to be paralleled in Greek' (Colwell 1931:131). The inevitable conclusion Colwell comes to, is that the claim that the author of John's Gospel thought or wrote in Aramaic cannot be substantiated by the available data. A few years later Goodspeed (1937) followed Colwell in denying an Aramaic Gospel, but made the statement that there existed no Aramaic literature in the first century!

Schuyler Brown (1964:332), in his analysis of the development of the research, refers to the proposition of Riddle and states that he 'added to the arguments of the Hellenistic school a study of the characteristics of translation Greek, as exemplified in these sections of the Septuagint which have been translated from Aramaic. These characteristics, in his view, are notably absent in our Greek gospels'.

These scholars undoubtedly effected a change in the radical view that the Fourth Gospel was originally a complete Aramaic Gospel, to the more moderate view that there are indeed Aramaic influences in John's Gospel. For instance, Barrett (1978:8-11) gives quite a number of Aramaic characteristics in John's Gospel, while never denying the Greek composition and character of John.

Beyer (1962), by a minute analysis of the conditional clauses in the Fourth Gospel and the comparison of other material, stressed that the main influence was not Aramaic but Hebrew. He describes the Greek of the Gospel as 'stark semitisierende Griechisch' (Beyer 1962:17). He furthermore concludes that the Fourth Gospel was written in plain and simple Greek, without solecisms, and used the Greek language for constructing the Gospel from the start. It thus appears that Beyer is not far from Schlatter's theories which also necessitate Hebrew sources.

It seems that today the general consensus is that John's Gospel was written in Greek but that Semitisms (whether Hebrew or Aramaic) can indeed be traced.

This is also the views of inter alia Schnackenburg (1965:88-94; 1968:105-111), Schuyler Brown (1964:338-339), Vorster (1972:19-27), R Brown (1982,1:cxxix-cxxx) and N Turner (1976:67-74). If one closely examines the studies of the above-mentioned scholars, it is clear that the majority of them introduced both for and against the Aramaic origin of the Gospel, the criterion of *style*. Although the results obtained from the analysis of the Greek of the Gospel varied vastly, the basic methodology is exactly the same — style is equated to grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Certain *phrases* and *expressions* were analyzed and where it seemed to be not quite classical Greek or very refined Greek syntax, a literal translation or at least a Semitic influence was postulated. The focus was on *syntax* and *grammar* and some strange *words* in transliteration such as 'Ραββί and others. All the research was conducted by examining the possible influence of Aramaic or Hebrew on the *syntax* of the Greek of John, and this was termed *stylistic*. This is of course one possible way of looking at the style of John, but necessarily a limited one. It is limited in the sense that bigger units were never examined with respect to composition and structure which could be indicative of further semitic influence. It would seem that again the *traditional* views on style which only consider words, syntax and grammatical features as indicators of style played a role in the way in which the research was conducted.

The whole debate on the linguistic origin of the Gospel was without doubt beneficial to the study of the Gospel and resulted in the identification of certain Semitisms which are important when analyzing a specific pericope. However, the fact remains that by identifying semitic influence in a limited number of examples in John the question of the style of the Gospel itself is hardly addressed. The whole exercise of trying to establish an Aramaic origin for the Gospel of John again served to indicate what the underlying perception of 'style' was for these researchers, and as we have indicated, this proved to be nothing more than a concentration on vocabulary, word order, syntax and grammar. Furthermore it is important to note that the whole Aramaic debate spanned a number of decades — which indicates that perceptions of style changed very little during the first three quarters of this century.

2.2.4 Style and other Johannine writings

The question of Johannine style was also frequently raised in connection with the other Johannine writings. Often the relationship between a specific writing and the Gospel was established or disproved by inter alia style criteria. This was of course done in order to try and answer the question of authorship. If a close stylistic-linguistic relationship, together with correlations in theological outlook, can be established, then the question of authorship seems to be answered. Without deciding on the validity of arguments for or against authorship and dependence, we can briefly look at what features of style scholars deemed important enough to be indicative of the style of the author of

the Gospel. To some extent one can also determine what these commentators understand 'style' to be.

(a) The Letters of John and John's Gospel

Here the main question is the one of authorship. Is the same hand to be detected in both the Gospel and the Letters? Critics such as Westcott (1892), Brooke (1912), Chapman (1911), Howard (1947), Wilson (1948), Salom (1955), Kilpatrick (1961) and Schnackenburg (1963) strongly contend for the common authorship of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles by using, *inter alia*, style criteria. Against these, some critics, on much the same grounds, argue against common authorship, for example Holtzmann (1908), Manson (1963), and especially Dodd (1953).

A close scrutiny of the considerations regarding style both for and against Johannine authorship, reveals that both sides hold the same views as to what style is. There is no real difference in the style criteria mentioned as proof *for* or *against* the views held on authorship. It is found that the *style* criteria mentioned center basically around aspects of mutual occurrence of words and expressions, vocabulary, constructions and syntax. As examples we have chosen two opposing views by scholars from roughly the same period to indicate how they substantiate opposing views with the same criteria. Dodd (1953:xlix-l) writes:

There is surely to be felt in the Fourth Gospel a richness, a subtlety, a penetrating quality of style to which the Epistle cannot pretend.... Thus, the impression of a certain monotony is confirmed by the observation that the writer of the Epistle greatly overworks a few favourite grammatical constructions; and that he uses a much smaller variety of compound verbs... and of those 'grammatical words' (particles, conjunctions, and the like) which, especially in Greek, give variety and individual colour to a writer's style.

Dodd (1953:1) in addition to this, also remarks on the absence of any Semitisms in the Epistles. Scholars opposed to Dodd's views remarkably enough also utilized style criteria to prove that there is definitely some common ground between the Gospel and Epistles. For instance Salom (1955:98-99) writes regarding some aspects of the style of 1 John:

In the Epistle 14 different prepositions occur a total of 174 times as against 23 in the Gospel which occur a total of 955 times. Apart from the very common prepositions, *ἐν*, *ἐκ* and *ἀπό* the majority of the prepositions are found with the accusative case... A rather rare use of the preposition *ἐκ* occurs at 4:10 where it is used in a partitive sense.... The great variety of prepositions in the Gospel compared with the paucity of same in the Epistle was cited by Dodd as one of the factors which determined his conclusion for dual authorship.

From both the above examples it is obvious that by the style of the Gospel and Epistle, *grammatical style* is meant. This is again a good example of the extent

to which the traditional approach to style has influenced the perception of style in general and in specific instances. What is also significant is the fact that by means of the same type of criteria, opposing conclusions are reached. This is so because by only treating a very small aspect of style, namely grammatical style, very little can be postulated about the style of a document or author.

(b) The Apocalypse and the Gospel of John

What was said for the way in which criteria of style were used to establish some relationship or not between the Gospel and the Letters, is to a great extent also true for the way in which grammatical style was used to relate the Gospel and the Apocalypse. Again we find that style is considered to be nothing more than *grammatical style*. A single example will suffice to illustrate this point. Charles (1963,1:xxix-xxxvii), when discussing the authorship of the Johannine writings, also includes a section on linguistic and stylistic evidence. This is again nothing more than grammar and syntax. He lists some grammatical differences, differences in diction, different words and forms, words and phrases with different meanings, and so forth. Under the heading of 'The Grammatical differences', Charles (1963,1:xxix) argues a point, and what is especially significant is his use of the term 'style':

I. *The grammatical differences.* — These make the assumption of a common authorship of J and J^{ap} absolutely impossible, unless a very long interval intervenes between the dates of J^{ap} and J.... Furthermore, our author's style shows no essential change in the interval of from 10 to 20 or more years, which elapsed between the writing of the Letters to the Seven Churches and the Apocalypse as a whole.... The main evidence is given under the heading, 'The Hebraic Style of the Apocalypse', but throughout the rest of the grammar the evidence is more than adequate to prove diversity of authorship [Charles' italics].

From this it is evident that *style* is for Charles equivalent to *grammar* as would the last sentence quoted above indicate. From the above it is evident that *style* is seen as grammatical style and nothing more. Poythress (1985) recently also used intersentence conjunctions (which are also of a grammatical nature) to test for a relationship between the Gospel and Revelation.

2.2.5 The study of Johannine style for other reasons

To a great extent most of the material mentioned here was already implicitly discussed or touched upon in the discussions above. For the sake of clarity a few more aspects will be mentioned, but it must be kept in mind that the same trends where style is mostly equated with aspects of formal grammar is also prevalent in these studies. As was shown in the discussion of Abbott, research into the style and language of John most of the time included a comparison with the language and grammar of the *Synoptic Gospels*.

Closely related to the question of sources is the question of the *composition* of the Gospel. Willemse (1965:13-15) and Smith (1965) give some indication of the basic trends in the study of the composition of the Gospel where linguistic and style analyses played a role. (See also the work of Mlakuzhyil 1987 discussed in detail hereunder.)

Another instance in Johannine research which to some extent made use of linguistic and style criteria is Johannine *Religionsgeschichte*, such as the research done by Schulz (1960), Meeks (1967) and Martyn (1970).

Before we deal with the following section on individual aspects of Johannine style, it must be noted that the above-mentioned approaches to style coincides to a large extent with the classification of literature on Johannine style found in the bibliography by van Belle (1988). From his section on style and language it is clear that what he considers style to be, is not really different from the so-called traditional perception of style. Studies done on both the question of Aramaisms, and descriptions of grammar and syntax, are included under the heading 'Style and language' (see Van Belle 1988:53-103). A close scrutiny of the third section he discusses under this heading, entitled 'Style characteristics', reveals that the studies mentioned there all deal with style in the way we indicated above. This is so because, although it is never mentioned explicitly, it seems that the studies named under style are classified there because the word 'style' occurs in the titles of articles, books and heading in books, and not because they are actually dealing with style as such. For instance, both the works of Fortna (1970) and Nicol (1972a) are mentioned here, because their works *inter alia* have a section on stylistic criteria for determining sources. In the same way the other works mentioned there also reveal that between 1965 and 1985 the traditional way of perceiving style was still much in the order of the day.

Markedly absent from considerations of style are aspects such as literary devices, narrative criticism, and so on. Van Belle (1988:118-128) indeed mentions these studies, but not in connection with style, which further confirms our observation that he also deals with a very limited perception of what style consists of. In the immediately following section we will deal with some of these.

2.3 Research on individual aspects of Johannine style

It must be recognized that, although during past decades very little was done on the style of the whole of the Gospel, some individual aspects of the style nevertheless were studied intensively. These studies were very valuable in so far as certain aspects of style received detailed attention, elucidating some of the problems regarding the use of language in the Fourth Gospel. However, a comprehensive approach, in which a combination or integration of the individual aspects is used is still lacking, and unfortunately very often studies on

individual aspects tend to become so detailed that only a few passages can be analyzed. It is, of course, impossible to quote everything done in this field. We can but offer a few examples of the more prominent studies done on individual aspects of Johannine style. Again the list is not given chronologically but rather thematically. Van Belle (1988:118-128) gives a full account of the work done in this respect since 1965. It must be stressed here that we will discuss aspects which are of singular importance for our present study in a little more detail.

2.3.1 Irony

Irony in John has been studied as a phenomenon since the days of George Salmon (1885:346-349). Some other scholars who devoted attention to the ironies of John were Clavier (1959), Wead (1970:47-68), MacRae (1973), Duke (1984), O'Day (1986), Culpepper (1987:165-180) and Kotze (1987). The four most recent publications are perhaps also the more important ones, since they contain some of the more recent research on irony and also combine this with important new aspects in linguistics and literary criticism such as narratological aspects and reader's response criticism. Duke, Culpepper and Kotze can be grouped together as they analyze and treat irony in John as a *literary device*. O'Day on the other hand contends that there is a definite connection between the *literary and theological* dimensions of irony. She subscribes to the views of MacRae (1973) who stressed the importance of understanding an author's theological aim through the device of irony. O'Day (1986:10) says regarding the aim of her study that her book 'will investigate the ways in which the Fourth Evangelist uses irony in the Gospel narrative to create and recreate the dynamics of revelation'. For her the theological aspect carries the most weight. Whereas Culpepper, Duke and Kotze place the focus on irony from the *reader's* perspective, O'Day claims that she does not present her analysis only from the perspective of the *author* as MacRae did, but that she incorporates the theological and literary dimensions. This is an important development and connection she makes here since it allows for the incorporation of the function of the texts as well as for the intended perlocution or effect of the texts, from the side of the author. This allows fully for a theological reading of the text while at the same time accommodating the very important shift from *text* to *reader* in the investigation of literary texts, which Holub (1984:1) describes as 'revolutionary'. The results and implications of these studies confirm that irony and the use of irony are, without question, very important for the study of the style of a text and should be investigated thoroughly.

2.3.2 The Fourth Gospel as drama.

This aspect of the research on the Fourth Gospel has received continuous attention from the beginning of this century. Jülicher (1904:389) likened the

Gospel to a drama. He was followed by inter alia Strachan (1925:14-31), Bowen (1930:292-305), Muilenburg (1932:40-42), Connick (1948:159) and more recently Talbert (1970), Flanagan (1981:264-270) and Domeris (1983:29-36). These scholars studied the Gospel from the viewpoint that the narrative character of the Gospel should not be emphasized as much as the dramatic character. This dramatic aim of the author 'may have affected his handling of traditional material' (Domeris 1983:29). This aspect of the Johannine story, although not widely accepted today, must be kept in mind when an analysis of the whole Gospel is undertaken, because it is certainly part of an author's strategy and the way in which he employs language.

2.3.3 Johannine misunderstandings and double meaning.

This is one of the aspects of the language of John which has been studied profoundly. Very few commentaries and studies on the language of John have no mention of this aspect, which is, of course, a very important aspect of Johannine style. Perhaps the most influential exponent of this aspect during the past two decades is Leroy (1968a; 1968b) who studied this literary device in John intensively. He followed in the footsteps of Cullmann (1948) and Conzelmann (1967) who used *doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke* and *Missverständnis* as terms. During the last few years Fenton (1970), Wead (1970), J Becker (1979:135-136), Carson (1982:59-91), and Richard (1985) have also published on the subject. The contribution of Richard is very valuable, since he also discusses the *function* of the double meaning in John. Since double meanings and irony often go hand in hand, O'Day (1986), and also Duke (1984), have discussed this feature profoundly in connection with Johannine irony.

2.3.4 Certain individual grammatical aspects

These aspects in John were repeatedly studied. For example, in 1984 Poythress published two articles on the use of intersentence conjunctions and *asyndeton* and their function in John. Invaluable is his list of occurrence in the Gospel, which is definitely something that must not be overlooked in analyzing the text of the Gospel, to determine something of the style, but again it is also a *grammatical* style feature, on a par with others so far discussed. Other aspects such as chiasm, were also studied, by inter alia Léon-Dufour (1960), Di Marco (1976) and Welch (1981:211-249). Similarly, despite the title of the article by Kilpatrick (1990:94-98), published posthumously, it deals only with grammatical aspects, and some text critical observations. From this it is also clear that style for Kilpatrick is nothing more than grammatical peculiarities.

2.3.5 Certain poetic qualities

Poetic features in the Gospel have also interested critics for a long time. Here aspects such as poetic rhythm, parallelism and so on are important. Burney (1925:63-99) notes that parallelism is not unique to the Fourth Gospel but is in fact common in all four Gospels. This he correlates to the influence of Old Testament poetry where parallelism is a fundamental feature. Gächter (1934-1936) treated a number of Johannine passages and tried to show their poetic format. Bultmann (1959) also maintained that the discourses in John retained the poetic format of the original source, as did Smith (1965). A number of commentaries also include a section on the poetic structure of John, for instance, Schnackenburg (1965:94-96; 1968:112-113), Brown (1982:xxxii-xxxv), and Barrett (1978:10-11).

2.3.6 Explanatory notes in the Gospel

The various asides and explanatory notes in John's text are also a feature which can be termed stylistic and which received ample attention in both commentaries and separate studies, for example Tenney (1960), O'Rourke (1979), Van Belle (1985), Culpepper (1987:16) and Lombard (1987). This is an important stylistic feature of the Gospel and as explicit explanation, interpretation, and evaluation in the text, it gives valuable insights into the strategies, aim and purpose of the communication of a text. It must, however, be stressed that it should not be studied in isolation but with full recognition of the interaction of this device with others. Care should also be exercised when identifying these 'asides', as will be indicated later.

2.3.7 Numerical patterns

Numerical patterns in the Gospel of John were the object of study of Menken (1985). He devoted the whole of his endeavor to the study of numbers as a technique of composition of the Gospel. He characterizes his program as a study of the surface structure of the text. Building on the work of Smit Sibinga (1970), he analyzed the text using conventional methods like literary criticism and redaction criticism. From this a preliminary observation concerning the literary structure is made. Then the numerical analysis, incorporating counts of words, syllables and so on in the different sections of text. Although the numerical analysis is only a secondary endeavor, to be compared to the already established structure, it serves for Menken as an objective criterion which can supplement the literary findings. If this can be established then it can be shown that numerical devices are a part of the structure of the text right from the start. Labuschagne (1987:16) also regards the efforts of numerical structural analysis highly:

I am seriously convinced that the rediscovery of the number as text-structuring element is the key for the uncovering of the way in which we can trace the biblical techniques of composition and discover exactly how the texts are made up. We can therefore hope that the fear of and prejudice against numbers in biblical science will soon be overcome [My translation of Dutch original].

He furthermore contends that this procedure is an objective procedure, which can be checked by anyone who wishes to do so. Regarding the additional help this can give in understanding texts, Labuschagne (1987:16) says that the numerical patterns help to establish the nature of the composition and that this 'via the symbolism of the numbers, deepen the content of their texts, and give the latent message contained in the codes of the numbers' [My translation of Dutch original].

Although it cannot be denied that numerical patterns do exist in certain texts, the whole crux of the matter is to determine whether this was indeed part of the original composition, and whether it serves any function in a specific text. Furthermore, it is problematic to use, for instance, the Nestle-Aland text, because it is a text compiled on the grounds of textual criticism and contains readings from a number of different traditions. The final texts are thus of a mixed nature and any numerical patterns must be ascribed to *Nestle-Aland*, the compilers of the *UBS* text, or the *Textus Receptus* and not to the original composition. Much more work should be done on the numerical analysis of (Gospel) texts before it can be accepted without any reserve.

2.3.8 The literary structure

The way in which the Gospel of John is structured, is also an indication of the style of the Gospel, since the structure determines which sections receive prominence. It establishes units and sections which are to be linked in the reading process, and which serves a communicative goal. In an exhaustive monograph on the literary structure of John, Mlakuzhyil (1987) surveys the research done to date on this question and lists no less than twenty-four different approaches to the determination of the structure of the Gospel. He then continues to develop his own structure for the Gospel and determines three criteria to establish this structure. In the *first place*, *literary criteria*, which include inclusions, conclusions, vocabulary, changes of genre, repetitions, liturgical feasts and so on. *Secondly*, *dramatic techniques* such as changes of dramatic personae, double stage action, the seven scene technique and so on are discussed. *Thirdly*, the criterion of *structural patterns* such as parallelism, chiasm, concentric structure and spiral structure are also used and discussed. Mlakuzhyil (1987:137) describes his *modus operandi* further:

In this chapter we shall apply these criteria so as to determine the literary structure of the Fourth Gospel.... Whenever possible, we shall look for the convergence of different kinds

of criteria. This will guarantee a greater objectivity.... We shall study the structure of the Gospel in three stages: (1) we shall examine its *main divisions*; (2) we shall divide these principal component parts into *sections*; (3) we shall establish the *structure of these sections* by subdividing them into subsections and comparing them with one another [Mlakuzhyil's italics].

Finally he discusses the relation between this structure and the christocentric theology of the Gospel, and concludes that the structure of the Gospel reveals the christocentric theology (Mlakuzhyil 1987:346-347).

It is clear from the book that Mlakuzhyil's perception of style is basically that it is limited to the few factors we identified in the *traditional approach*, as his remarks on the nature of style and his acceptance of the traditional notions indicate (see Mlakuzhyil 1987:7-8, 11). However, his work is very valuable for the study of the style of the Gospel in its entirety, as we remarked above. D M Smith (1976:11) affirms this view, although he is talking about exegesis: 'The exegesis of any text must take account of its position and role in the document of which it is part. Thus our exegesis of Johannine texts must keep the structure of the Fourth Gospel in view.' Although Mlakuzhyil did not recognize this, because of his views of style, his work is extremely important for the study of the style of the Gospel. This is because the structure and composition of the text indicate something about the plan of the author and the choices he made concerning the textual context of units, all of which are part of his style.

2.3.9 Other literary devices

There are a number of other literary devices in the Fourth Gospel that received some attention in recent years, which also can be of significance for the study of Johannine style. We can but mention a few here. K E Dewey (1980), Tragan (1980) and a little earlier Sturch (1977-78) also gave attention to *parables* in John. *Epanalepsis* as a redactional technique has been commented upon by Von Wahlde (1976), Boismard (1977:235-241) and also by Neiryneck (1980). Other aspects such as *riddle* (Van Halsema 1983), *typology* (Hansen 1948), and *repetitions* (Morris 1969:293-319; Chang Shiu-Chi 1975; Deakle 1985) have received limited attention, but are nevertheless of importance for obtaining a more comprehensive picture of Johannine style. The *dualism* of John also has received ample attention. Böcher (1965), J Becker (1974) and Barrett (1982:98-115) have commented on this aspect which can also be of significance in our present endeavor. Finally, the aspect of *symbolism* can also be of interest in the study of style. Stemberger (1970) has written on the symbolism of good and evil in John, Schneiders (1977) on history and symbolism, Pamment (1985) on path and residence metaphors, and Léon-Dufour (1981) and Diel and Solotareff (1983) inter alia on symbolism in general.

2.3.10 Narrative art in John

Since early on in this century the narrative character of John has also been the subject of study for a large number of scholars such as Windisch (1923) and Wrede (1933). The full introduction of modern narratology into the study of the New Testament has proved to be very fruitful. Vorster (1986:60) comments:

In conclusion it seems to me that not only is it possible for New Testament scholars to learn a lot from insights of narratology offered by modern theorists, it is also possible to gain insights into the nature of New Testament narratives. There is undoubtedly a need to rethink the history of early Christian literature from a perspective where much less emphasis is put on the growth and the origin of texts and more on the written texts and the way in which the material they contain is organized.

Cahill (1982), Olsson (1974) and Culpepper (1987) are examples of Johannine scholars who utilized modern narratology in the study of the Gospel in recent years. These studies (especially that of Culpepper) are of great significance for the study of the Gospel. In a narrative analysis the focus is on aspects such as the narrator, time, characters in the story, the plot, point of view, and implied authors and readers. In short, it focuses on the way in which the story is told, the total effect of the story and the way in which the different parts of the story interact. The focus is now on the document as a *whole* and not so much on the origins, sources, strata and historical questions. After all, the texts functioned in the early Christian communities as complete written documents and not as a conglomeration of sources where their origins still played a role. It is obvious that this approach is very significant for the study of the style of the Gospel. The total picture which serves to elucidate the style of a writer is now the object of study, and not any longer only isolated features. The incorporation of the concepts of narratology into the description of an author's style is therefore of paramount importance. South African exponents of the narratological analysis of John's Gospel are inter alia Du Rand (1983-1986), Engelbrecht (1987) and G F Snyman (1988).

2.3.11 John and reception theory

During the 1970s a revolution occurred in literary scholarship with the introduction of reader response criticism into literary studies. The focus now fell on readers, reading processes and responses to literature. In this regard the works of Rainer (1975), Iser (1978), Suleiman and Crosman (1980), Jauss (1982) and Holub (1984) can be useful in obtaining a perspective on the development of the theory and on the theory itself. This important aspect of the study of literature has also been widely introduced in the study of the texts of the Bible. We can therefore not agree with Eslinger (1987:167) when he states that 'in biblical studies we are beginning to see a shift from strictly historical concerns

to those of the New Critics. Major concern for the reader's influence on interpretation remains largely over the horizon'.

That this is indeed not the case can be seen in recent publications, pre-dating Eslinger, for instance Fowler's (1981) work on Mark; Richards (1983); Phillips (1983); Resseguie (1984); Petersen (1984); Kotze (1985); Staley (1986a) and others. Kotze, Staley and Eslinger concentrated their efforts on John's Gospel. There are a growing number of Johannine scholars who concern themselves with reception theory, because this line of approach provides new methods of analysis, and new insights into texts, which are of extreme importance for the interpretation of ancient texts such as the Bible. This specific line of approach utilizes the concepts of narrative criticism and extends the concept of the reader and the reader's response much more than the narrative critics did. For instance Culpepper (1987:210-11) who in his narrative analysis of the Gospel of John also utilized the insights of reception theory, remarks that 'further progress may be possible if studies on the phenomenology of reading can be applied to the interpretation of John. It is hoped that this chapter and each of the previous ones will make some contribution to this task but a fully developed application of the themes of reading... must be put on a future agenda'.

The most comprehensive study of the Fourth Gospel in the light of reception theory, is perhaps the study by Staley (1986a). Staley mentions *inter alia* the works of Olsson (1974), Culpepper (1987), Boers (1980), Phillips (1983) and Wuellner (1981), who dealt with the concept of the reader in John. Staley (1986a:33-34) points out a number of deficiencies in each of these approaches and concludes that

our critique of the five studies of Johannine narrative concentrated upon four major areas where their analyses of the 'implied reader' could have been considerably strengthened... we noted that the five Johannine studies also lacked any clear formulation of narrative temporality and its relationship to the implied reader. We then went on to point out that clarifications in areas of focalization, discourse order and story order, and the level of discourse might have made their respective 'implied readers' a more useful construct for New Testament exegetes.

Staley then focuses on these deficiencies and tries to, on the grounds of chapters 1-3, and the strategies employed there, to show how the implied readers are formed, and how these strategies are developed and used in the rest of the Gospel narrative. This work of Staley is a very good example of the way in which the concepts of contemporary narrative criticism and reception theory are fused and developed to describe the dynamics of a text. Needless to say, these studies are of extreme importance to the study of the style of the Gospel, as they can account for techniques and the ways in which language is employed, which are also characteristic of a text, and therefore descriptive of the style. These developments, along with the implementation of narrative criticism, have also now provided descriptive tools for analyzing texts which were not available to

biblical scholars two decades ago. The fact is, however, that the implications of the development of something like reception theory for the study of style has not yet been spelled out.

3. Conclusion

It must be kept in mind that this brief and cursory survey does not pretend to be and *exhaustive* account of the research done on the style of the Gospel of John. As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter a more comprehensive bibliography on Johannine research during the past two decades is presented by Van Belle (1988). The main purpose here was merely to give an indication of the *trends* and *approaches* to style in Johannine studies. From the survey a few points have materialized, and which can be summarized as follows:

- * The notion of what style is, has remained virtually static since the end of the previous century. The results of modern linguistic research and stylistics have not been incorporated into Johannine style studies.

- * The way in which style is perceived can be termed traditional for most of the studies referred to in the survey. This indicates that by style, 'grammatical style' should be understood. A few other aspects of style on a limited scale such as misunderstanding, irony and so on are traditionally also discussed, but only in isolation from other aspects.

- * This notion of style results in a very narrow and limited view and utilization of style features in exegesis and so forth. Usually style features and characteristics are introduced as subsidiary aspects for some other purpose.

- * By taking style mainly as grammatical style very little can be stated about an author's style. This has usually resulted in the use of so-called style statistics where opposing positions were often justified by the *same* principles. (For a critique on style statistics, also see Dolezel and Bailey 1969.)

- * Often individual aspects of style can indeed be very valuable in expounding a text, but one usually gets the impression that if other considerations were also taken into account something much more satisfactory could be the result; but because of the limited perception of style, this possibility has so far not yet been explored.

- * Because of the very narrow and limited views of style, some aspects which are of extreme importance to style, were not recognized as aspects pertaining to style, and therefore not considered to be of importance for the description of style. For instance, composition, narrative structure, and reception theory have so far not been studied in terms of style.

- * We can thus agree with Olsson (1974:3-4) that in the field of Johannine style studies a more comprehensive approach to style is essential:

Commentaries make little mention of such subsidiary problems as the Semitic character of Johannine language, certain lexicographical and syntactic peculiarities, poetic qualities such as parallelism and rhythm, variation of expression, repetitions, use of inclusions, chiasms and structural patterns, ambiguity, misunderstanding, 'irony', dramatic qualities, personal roles, dialogue structure, narrative style, line of thought in the monologues, figurative language, minor literary forms, cross-references, remarks in the text, composition etc. Nevertheless there is no investigation incorporating these subsidiary problems, or a part of them, into a collated linguistic survey, based on what we now know of how language and texts function.

* The two most promising developments in biblical scholarship in recent years, for the study of Johannine style, is the ascendance of narrative criticism and reception theories, since these approaches are both very comprehensive and provide valuable concepts which can also be appropriated by stylisticians in the description of style.

We have in this first chapter indicated that in the field of Johannine research there has been to date no adequate description of Johannine style as such. This is so for the simple reason that the traditional perception of style has merely focused on a few singularities and single elements. In addition to this, there has been no effort to utilize or incorporate the results of style studies in the field of general linguistics and literary criticism. This resulted in a state of affairs where the significance of more comprehensive approaches to texts were not even considered to be of significance for style as such. Recent developments in Johannine research have not considered their results as offering anything for Johannine style studies, because in terms of the traditional description of style these later developments are not stylistic, and are of a much more comprehensive nature than what the usual perception of style is.

Before we can attempt a description of a possible way in which the style of a text or document such as the Fourth Gospel can be depicted, the question of what *style* exactly comprises, needs to be answered. In the next chapter we will attempt to indicate the developments of recent years in the field of general stylistics, and how these developments can be utilized to arrive at an adequate theory regarding style in John's Gospel.

CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS STYLE?

1. The history and theory of contemporary stylistics

The technical term '*style*' is used mainly by linguists and literary scholars. However, there seems to be no consensus between these two disciplines, or even between researchers from within the same discipline, as to what exactly the notion of style consists of, and what the term '*style*' in effect refers to. We have made the *distinction* between linguists and literary scholars here, only because these two separate disciplines are the two disciplines which supposedly deal with, *inter alia*, the phenomenon of style as such, each in its own peculiar way.

Furthermore these disciplines are considered to be different in scope, aim, and methodology. However, regarding the actual situation in the field of stylistic analysis, the distinctions are no longer as clear, and the two disciplines seem to merge somewhat. The reasons for, and the development of this merging of the disciplines will shortly be explained. Because stylists/stylisticians come from such largely divergent traditions, which in themselves can contain opposing and different views, it is hardly surprising to find divergent perceptions of style. In addition, the term '*style*' is extremely hard to define. Enkvist (1985b:14) remarks that 'both "rhetoric" and "stylistics" are terms notorious for their richness in ambiguity'. However, the fact remains that there is indeed a discipline or science called '*stylistics*' which claims to deal with the elusive phenomenon called style.

The study of the different stylistic features in texts, as we have it today, has been influenced by a number of developments in linguistics and literary criticism during the course of this century. To understand the current situation and the problematic nature of the definition of '*style*', it is necessary to offer a short analysis of the emergence of *modern* stylistic thinking. We do this for a number of reasons.

First, although stylistics is not something new and has been the object of serious study since ancient times, we will limit ourselves to a description of the emergence of modern stylistics during this century, because modern stylistic theory has undergone remarkable developments in the past three decades, because of stimuli presented by new developments in the fields of both linguistics and literary theory. This exerted great influence on current stylistic thinking. Our *historical* point of departure will be approximately the first half of this century, since one can trace the current state of stylistic thinking in the late 1980s to influences dating from that period. This does not mean that we can

disregard the concepts of traditional rhetoric and stylistics dating from ancient times, but the situation as it now stands, is that modern stylistics does not disregard the precepts of traditional views, but rather tends to use them, and combine them with modern literary theory. It is exactly these new additions to traditional perceptions that are the factors that need to be understood, in order to grasp the current state of affairs regarding modern stylistic thinking.

Secondly, since it is clear from the previous chapter, that modern stylistics has not yet been introduced in Johannine studies, and that Johannine scholars are to a large extent not informed on the subject, it is also a contributing consideration to offer an overview of what modern stylistics has to offer. A representation of what is relevant in the field of stylistics, will also clarify and explain the approach followed in this thesis. What is presented here is merely an *introductory* summary, and not an *exhaustive* account of the situation. The question of the applicability and appropriateness of using modern stylistics to analyze the texts of ancient documents, such as the Bible, will be answered in due course.

1.1 Historical development

In our discussion of the development of modern day stylistic thinking, we have followed in broad lines information supplied by Fowler (1971; 1981), because of the very thorough categorization, the clear way in which he depicts the links between different developments worldwide, and because he also classifies his own contributions as being part of the 'New Stylistics' movement.

It seems that today there is a general acceptance of the fact that *literary style* and *linguistics* are closely linked. Bennett (1983:429) remarks that 'during the 1950's and 1960's the serious application of linguistic theories and methods to literary texts became a world-wide enterprise. During those two decades literary scholars and linguists learned each others trades'.

Fowler (1971:1-9) gives some valuable information on the history of literary and linguistic approaches to literature and explains how the '*rift*' which for many years prohibited any real or constructive interlocution and even cooperation between the two disciplines, came into existence. This state of affairs was, according to Fowler, due to the fact that the study of *literature* (meaning post-medieval literature) on the one hand, and *philology* (and subsequently linguistics) on the other, were considered to be mutually exclusive by representatives from both disciplines. Fowler (1971:2) explains these perceived differences in that: 'Philology deals in "facts"... possesses analytic "techniques", employs "jargon". The study of literature entails consideration of "values", and "values" are felt to be the antitheses of facts and thus unamenable to scientific study.'

Fowler (1971:3) himself prefers to call the linguistic study of literature (linguistics and literary criticism combined) 'linguistic criticism', and dates the

beginnings of this science to approximately 1951. He indicates that in the same year the grounds for *American Structuralism* was laid by the publication of books by Harris (1951), and Trager and Smith (1951). This so-called American structuralism was basically a descriptive type of linguistics, where very little attention was paid to the *meaning* of the utterances under discussion, since the emphasis was on *structures* but, 'in practice, linguists had to make constant surreptitious references to meaning in order to establish their phonetic and syntactic units, while at the same time the frontal description of meaning was almost totally neglected' (Fowler 1971:4-5; see also Jefferson 1987:92-121 on structuralism in general).

In 1958, the *Indiana Conference of Style* took place and the openness and cooperation between literary critics and linguists were beginning to be actualized. This interdisciplinary contact was to be of fundamental importance for the development of modern stylistics. Bailey (1967:1-2), also considers this an important event, for this conference was for him 'a significant watershed between the casual consideration of literary style from a linguistic point of view and the treatment of linguistic stylistics as a discipline worthy of serious scholarly interest'. In the publication of the papers read at the conference, Ashton (1960:v) remarks, regarding the significance of the conference, that 'it also reflects a genuine attempt by a group of scholars from several disciplines to bring their special resources of knowledge to bear on one problem: the nature and characteristics of style in literature'. In this way, a firm basis for the forging together of *literary criticism* and *linguistics* was laid. Bennett (1983:429-430) quotes a large number of publications subsequent to this conference in which this new alliance between linguistics and literary criticism were exploited.

Following these events, a far reaching revolution in linguistics occurred in 1957, when a student of Harris, Noam Chomsky, published the first of a series of books on a new approach to linguistics, called *transformational generative grammar*. The influence of this Chomskyan approach changed the traditional way of thinking about language — especially in the field of syntactic analysis, but its influence was not only limited to this field. It also proved extremely fruitful in other areas of research such as semantics, pragmatics, and of course, stylistics. Fowler (1981:13) indicates that not only linguistics benefited from this, but that other 'disciplines such as stylistics received continuous stimulation from the development, the increasing power of the parent linguistics. As new aspects of language came under scrutiny of linguistics, stylisticians followed each development and added a succession of new analytical tools to their equipment'.

One of the advantages of this cross-influence by the methodology offered by linguistics on stylistics, is that the developments enabled stylists to appropriate and utilize the linguists' new-found, and more accurate ways of describing and of delineating numerous aspects and structures present in texts, such as the verbal structure. In addition to this area of linguistics, with both its American and European counterparts, two other areas of research, initiated a little earlier,

also began to influence the notion of style and stylistics during this period. These two areas were literary criticism in the form of *New Criticism* and *French structuralism*. In 1924 Richards published a book called *Principles of literary criticism*. Richards and Empson followed this with a book on practical criticism in 1929. These were pioneering works, investigating some theoretical and descriptive aspects of language, based on traditional rhetorical and verbal analyses of texts. This method of approaching, analyzing and describing texts became known as 'Practical Criticism', in England, and 'New Criticism', in America. Exponents of the latter were literary scholars such as Ransom (1941), Brooks and Warren (1964), Leavis (1948, 1952) and journals such as *The Hudson Review* and *The Sewanee Review* both edited by Tate (1944-1946) (see also Rabinowitz 1982:24-40 and Robey 1987:73-91 on the development of New Criticism). In the 1940s a refined and more articulate theory was introduced, particularly in the works of Wellek and Warren in 1942, Wimsatt (1954), and Brooks (1947). According to these, and other exponents of the same position, especially the American New Criticism, a literary text is a self contained unit — unique and self-sufficient, to be studied quite apart from historical, sociological and psychological factors. The text is seen as having no influence on the world around it and only the integrated verbal patterns of the text in isolation are to be studied (see Robey 1987:80). Limited as this approach might have been, it nevertheless again focused attention on the *language of the texts*. This was important, because of its influence on the new approach to stylistics, which began in the 1950s, in which linguistics started to play a more significant role, proved to be very fruitful. A further discipline, which, according to Fowler (1981:14), contributed a great deal to stylistics, was *French Structuralism*, using the term in its broadest sense, including French literary theory, linguistics, semiotics of language and culture, and so on. This approach is based on Ferdinand de Saussure's work which was published in 1916, entitled in English *Course in General linguistics*. Saussure argued for a new science of signs which he called 'semiology'. This would include all systems of signs or signifiers within a society — ranging from fashion and architecture to language and gesture (see Jefferson 1987:92-3). Language, however, is seen as the semiological system which stands centrally, as the 'most complex and characteristic of all systems of expression' (Jefferson 1987:93). The importance of Saussurean structuralism for literary studies is that it provides three linked perspectives on texts where 'the text may be seen as a sequence of sentences each to be analyzed linguistically; or as a single unified construction with its own particular internal structure... third, a literary text may be seen as a unit within a literary system, within the context of a set of other relevance works... related to semiotic structure of the whole culture' (Fowler 1981:14).

Because this perspective on language is based in linguistics, it provided concepts and ideas previously not available to scholars researching literary style, and which, because of the new willingness to incorporate aspects of linguistics in

the literary study of texts, proved very fruitful for literary studies utilizing linguistics. This also was beneficial for the developing field of stylistics, which built on linguistics.

These above-mentioned three areas which exerted considerable influence on the development of stylistic thinking, are of course not without their problems. For instance, the transformational grammar developed in the wake of Chomsky's work, is limited in the sense that it does not concern itself with considerations of the function of language, which is a rather important notion in literary study. The very important aspect of the close links between the text and its social and historical contexts, is neglected in this approach. In *literary* circles, functionality is an important concept, and cannot be discussed in isolation from social context. It means that in a linguistic theory of style these limitations must be overcome by implementing aspects and views from functional and sociological linguistic theories. Similarly, the limitations of the New Critics must also be kept in mind. The chief concern here is that in this approach, texts are seen in isolation from their historical contexts. Nevertheless, it seems that Fowler (1981) is indeed correct in concluding that French structuralism, linguistics and New Criticism have played a significant role in structuring modern thought on style and the nature of stylistics. It is also significant to note that modern thought on style insists that linguistics and literary criticism are both part and parcel of 'style'. Fowler (1981:11) confirms this by arguing that 'stylistics is "literary" from the point of view of linguistics or "linguistic" from the perspective of literary studies. In either case, what is meant, in a nutshell, is the application of theoretical ideas and analytic techniques drawn from linguistics to the study of literary texts'.

Together with these, other new developments in the field of *literary theory*, *linguistics* and *pragmatics* have directly and indirectly influenced stylistics, and are important considerations which have influenced contemporary views on style. These influences opened new horizons for stylists, and the result was that other aspects of language and communication were investigated, apart from those traditionally considered to relate to style. Traditionally style was described in terms of meter, phonology, vocabulary, syntax, rhetoric, and so on. The new developments provided additional ways of approaching style.

We can name but a few of the more prominent developments, in some of these areas, in the past decade or two. The following were chosen specifically because they are of great significance for our present undertaking, and for the study of biblical texts in general, and they are beginning to influence the exegesis of these texts.

In the first place, an important factor which has come into play in the field of *literary study* and which has received great emphasis in recent years, is the focus on the *activity of reading* itself. Abrams (1987:149-150) defines this approach as follows:

Reader-Response Criticism does not designate any one critical theory, but a focus on the activity of reading a work of literature which is shared by many of the critical theories, American and European, which have come into prominence since the 1960's.... Reader response critics of all theoretical persuasions agree that, at least to some degree, that the meanings of a text are the 'production' or 'creation' of the individual reader [Abrams' italics].

This focus on the activity and contribution of the reader is a very important and significant insight, and must somehow be accounted for in any description of style in literature. MacLean (1987:122-144) provides a very useful summary of the various trends in this field. See also the literature quoted in the preceding chapter on the use of this approach to texts in Johannine scholarship. That this development is also of interest to the study of the style of texts, is indicated by Enkvist (1985a:255) as he remarks that 'we might now try a fusion between the views of style as choice and style as situational variation, and suggest that styles arise from a situationally determined choice of expression. A speaker or writer opts for a style by choosing between alternatives in the light of a specific situation. We can also adapt this approach to describe what happens in a receptor, hearer or reader'.

Secondly, the development of modern *narratology* is also a factor which can greatly influence the perception of the style of a specific text. In the previous chapter we indicated that concepts of this had already been implemented in the study of the Fourth Gospel, but this has so far not been done in relation to style as such. However, the impact of modern narrative studies on stylistics must not be overlooked or underestimated.

Thirdly, another influence not to be disregarded in the study of modern stylistics is the approach discussed by inter alia Platt and Platt (1975), Fowler (1981), Lyons (1985:266-297) and Halliday (1964; 1970; 1978), which could be called a *sociological approach* to language and literature, and which includes sociolinguistics, sociosemiotics and so on. Within this model, the context in which a specific communication is taking place is of the utmost importance in understanding the structure, meaning and function of the communication. Fowler (1981:28) states regarding this contextual determination of language usage that

linguistic structure is not arbitrary, but is determined by, or motivated by, the sanctions it performs. Furthermore, all parts of language are functional in this sense, not just the structures that explicitly serve social and interpersonal ends like personal pronouns, address forms, speech acts and so on. It follows for the interpretation of discourse that any choice of words and syntactic constructions can have some significance assigned to it.

Fowler (1981:24) himself prefers to call this approach 'linguistic criticism' and locates it within the fields of both literary and linguistic criticism, with reference of course to the relevant sociological factors involved. Within Fowler's framework it seems that he principally opts for the notion that style has to do

with choice. This stylistic choice is determined by the social context and must therefore be interpreted in the light of a specific context (see Fowler 1981:35). Halliday (1970:140) also agrees with this: 'The particular form taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve.' This is, of course, important for the study of style. Any stylistic theory that proceeds from the notion that style has to do with choices, must somehow take the factors that determine these choices into consideration.

Fourthly, it must be noted that other areas in linguistics, such as semantics, have also received a new impetus in recent years. Of great significance for us, is the work on *biblical semantics*, triggered by the work of James Barr (1961), which exerted a great deal of influence on current semantic thinking in the field of the semantics of biblical literature. Also noteworthy in this regard, is the monograph by Silva (1983) on lexical semantics, in which he explores semantic description on the level of individual words, while at the same time acknowledging that linguistic meaning can also be studied on the levels of the sentence and discourse. The impetus provided by Barr has also had other secondary effects and influences. In the field of *biblical semantics and lexicography*, for instance, linguists like Eugene Nida (1975) and others have developed a semantic theory called componential analysis of meaning where meaning is described in terms of sets of componential features. The work of Nida culminated in the publication in 1988 of a revolutionary New Testament dictionary based on semantic domains (see Louw & Nida 1988). Also in the field of semantics, the work by inter alia Nida and Louw (1983) on *style and discourse* is an attempt to indicate how different stylistic formations function in the Greek New Testament. While this publication is a giant step in the right direction, the emphasis is still very much on the classical rhetorical features, supplemented by lexical and discourse semantics. In this sense, the results of this particular study were limited, but it nevertheless indicated how aspects such as rhetorical structures, text types, knowledge of the communication process and semantics in general can assist in understanding and describing the dynamics of texts somewhat better.

In the *fifth* place, a very important development in the field of *pragmatics* is the emergence of the notion of *speech acts*. Speech act theory is basically directed against the traditional view that sentences can be analyzed adequately in isolation from the context and circumstances of the utterance, and the view that the standard sentence is a type of utterance that can only be judged either true or false. Against this view of language philosophers like Austin [1962] (1975), Strawson (1964), Searle [1969] 1977, and Grice (1975a) proposed that a speaker does not only communicate some proposition but in fact perform a specific action. Chapter 3 of this book provides a full description of the theory of speech acts, but we give a brief outline here for the sake of clarity. These acts performed by producing utterances can be of a threefold nature, that is, a

locutionary act (where a recognizable grammatical sentence is produced and an object is referred to); an *illocutionary act* (questioning, praising, commanding, etc) is performed; and sometimes a *perlocutionary act* (dealing with the impact or implication) is also performed. Speech act theory has in recent years had considerable impact on the study of language and literature as Abrams (1987:182-183) indicates:

Since 1970 speech act theory has influenced conspicuously the theory and practice of literary criticism.... It provides a systematic but rather cumbersome framework for identifying the unspoken presuppositions and implications of speech acts which competent critics have always taken into account, subtly though unsystematically. Speech act theory has also been used, however, as a model on which to recast the theory of literature in general, and especially the theory of prose narratives.

The explosion of literature both in the form of monographs and articles confirms this. It is, however, true that this new way of approaching literature has so far had very little effect on the literary/linguistic study of the *Bible* (see Chapter Three for a short list), and to date, with the exception of a short and somewhat inadequate discussion by Wendland (1985:175-179), virtually nothing has been published on *John* where speech act theory has been used. A volume of *Semeia* (1988, vol 41) entitled *Speech act theory and biblical criticism* was recently published and can be seen as the beginnings of the utilization of speech act theory in biblical exegesis on a broad basis. The fact that a whole volume is devoted to speech act theory also reflects the realization of the importance of this specific view of language.

An important aspect pertaining to speech acts in the field of pragmatics is *implicature*. Implicatures are unstated propositions which a reader is able to deduce from what is actually stated by means of convention, presuppositions and the like. It helps to give explanations of why users of language are able to read 'between the lines' as they so often have to do. This idea is expounded with regard to style by Grice (1975a) and Leech and Short (1981), while Du Plessis (1988:311-313) and Leech (1983:30-32) also offer a full discussion on the nature of implicature. The *result* of all the above-mentioned influences and developments on the study of style resulted in what is known as the 'New Stylistics' analysis of prose. The characteristic of New Stylistics' is that 'linguistic terminology and methods are introduced into the study of literary style. In terms of the popularity and the quantity of published material, the New Stylistics has proved to be the most successful attempt at bridging the gap between linguistics and literary scholarship so far' (Mair 1985:117).

1.2 The current situation

One conclusion that can be drawn from the foregoing survey is that all of the above-mentioned developments of and approaches to linguistic and literary

analysis have contributed to some extent to the study of style in recent years. Depending on the emphasis laid on certain text theories, the understanding of what style and stylistics is, can be defined in any number of terms. The result is that often seemingly contradictory statements as to the nature of style are found in the current debate. This is one of the biggest problems of the New Stylistics and of modern stylistics in general: Because of the appropriation of so many of the concepts of literary criticism, linguistics, semantics, pragmatics and so on, stylisticians have so many possible applicable options available to them that they often just use these concepts in an inarticulate manner. The result is the often vague and contradictory definitions of style so frequently found in the literature dealing with style. For some, style is merely the distinction between what is said, and how it is said, that is, the distinction between the content and the form of a text. For others, style only pertains to the formal properties of language or stylistic features such as phonological, syntactic, lexical and rhetorical features.

Abrams (1987:193) gives an indication of how some of the different approaches of different stylists are the result of different presuppositions:

Stylisticians who aim at scientific rigor use quantitative methods to calculate the relative frequencies of stylistic features.... Others instead make use of linguistic concepts such as the distinction between *paradigmatic* and *syntagmatic* relations in language; or else of *transformational grammar*... or else of *Speech-Act Theory*.... Sometimes the stylistic enterprise stops with the more-or-less quantitative determination.... Usually, however, the analyst tries also to relate distinctive stylistic features to traits in an author's psyche; or to his characteristic ways of perceiving the world and organizing experience ... or to the ideology and attitudes to reality of an era... or else to particular aesthetic and emotional functions and effects [Abrams' italics].

A few other examples will also illustrate the frustrating situation with which any researcher is faced when the field of stylistics is scrutinized. The definitions are often vague and inarticulate and it is not clear from which side the question of style is approached. We offer but a few quotations here, to try and convey the experience of being overwhelmed by a plenitude of divergent approaches to style with which one is faced when approaching the subject. It is often unclear what specific approach or understanding plays a role in the formulation of a definition, and this makes evaluation of different approaches very difficult. *Beardsley* (1969:5) defines his view of style as follows:

The clearest way to say what style is, I think, is to say what a *difference* in style is. Take two sentences... S1 and S2. We say that they differ in style when two things are true about them. First, they differ to some extent in *meaning*. And second, the difference is not on the plane of overt or explicit meaning, but on the plane of covert or implicit meaning.... It follows from this analysis that the concept of style is intensively comparative... style is detail of implicit meaning [Beardsley's italics]

Barthes (1971:10) sees style as part of a set of textual elements which 'must consist today of seeing style as one of a number of textual elements: a number of semantic levels (codes), the interweaving of which forms the text, and a number of citations which reside in that code which we call "style"'.

Todorov (1971:30) distinguishes two notions of style: 'Style as coherence, that is as form, structure, totality, a unique and harmonious assemblage of several more general categories within the particular work...[and] Style as deviation, this is infraction, transgression of a norm.' He then rejects these notions and defines his own views on style in terms of the classical definitions of style as follows:

Style is not coherence nor is it deviation, nor tracing made of this or that social stratum. But what is it then? I find the first useful occurrence of the term in the ancient division into low, middle and devoted styles... because style is here conceived as an internal characteristic of a kind of discourse, and as an abstract category, not as a unique configuration of properties to be found in an individual work.

(Todorov 1971:32)

Turner (1973:7) states that 'linguistics is the science of describing language and showing how it works; stylistics is that part of linguistics which concentrates on variation in the use of language'.

Widdowson (1975:3) closely links linguistics and literary criticism: 'By stylistics I mean the study of literary discourse from a linguistics orientation and shall take the view that what distinguishes stylistics from literary criticism on the one hand, and linguistics on the other, is that it is a linking of the two.'

Enkvist (1985a:251-255) gives a brief but valuable description of some nine different views of style *currently* being debated, inter alia, definitions of style as a situationally conditioned language variation, style as choice, and style as a decorative halo of stylistic features.

From these very divergent and confusing definitions of style and stylistics, which stem from presuppositions which are not spelled out to readers, it is clear that inevitably terminological problems regarding the notion of style will arise. This is because both the term and the concept 'style' are very vague and elusive and subject to quite a number of interpretations. For some it involves merely a few grammatical singularities and for others it includes all the codes, linguistically and otherwise, that make up the whole of a text. *Bennett* (1983:430) concludes: 'The outpouring [of literature on style — JEB] has been expectedly exceeded by a torrential diversity of terminology.... A bibliography of stylistics today requires a sophisticated, large, and ever expanding glossary.'

The terminology used can, of course, not be separated from the presuppositions that are basic to the theory of language and its operation in literary texts. This basic underlying theory does to a great extent, determine the connotations and implications of the terminology implemented. However, these

basic presuppositions are in most cases not spelled out clearly or even considered by researchers and this results in the unfortunate confusing state of affairs.

It seems, therefore, absolutely necessary that the basic underlying language or text theory must be accounted for in an enquiry into the style of a text or texts. This will shape the *expectations* regarding the outcome of a specific enquiry, and will also help the *evaluation* of the success of the specific program in relation to the theory implemented. In this regard, Enkvist (1985a:262-263) identifies four types of text models each of which has significance for the study of style.

First, there are sentence-based text models which according to Enkvist (1985a:262) have the specific purpose in mind to 'accept a text such as it is, without tampering with its clauses and sentences and then try to reveal the features that link clauses and sentences to each other'.

Secondly, Enkvist (1985a:262) mentions that these text models are of limited scope and cannot be expected to explain the origin and specific formation of sentences as such. To address these specific problems theories are developed in which researchers 'will go on to build text models which start out from some kinds of text atoms, the basic text units which are then combined into texts according to definite, explicit strategies. If we symbolize these text atoms with predication, we might call such a model predication-based'.

Thirdly, the origin of these predication itself can be a relevant question that can also, according to Enkvist (1985a:262), be addressed in an enquiry into the dynamics of language: 'If we ask how predication are born, we shall need a third type of model, one capable of extracting predication out of a store of knowledge. As such knowledge stores turn into models of human cognition, we might call such text models cognitive.'

In the *fourth* place, the observation that any user of language utilizes the language and all the possibilities it offers, in a manner closely related to the context and participants of a specific communicative situation, demands that explanations are found for the speaker's choice of words. Questions that can be asked in this regard are, in the words of Enkvist (1985a:262-263), questions such as:

Why does he extract certain specific predication from his store of knowledge, and then textualize them? In his textualization, what politeness devices does he opt for, and why? Does he surround his text proper with metatext, modalities, phatic expressions and the like? How does he co-ordinate his behaviour with that of others in dialogue? To answer questions of this type, the sentence-based, predication-based, and cognitive text models will not suffice. We shall need a fourth type of text model that we might call interactional.

Each of these different possibilities of text or discourse models has its own significance for the study of style, and it is clear that, depending on the text or discourse model that is presupposed, definitions of what style is all about, will take on a different color. Enkvist (1985a:263) describes the relevance this has

specifically for the study of *style*: 'Text and discourse linguistics provide us with a new stock of concepts for the definition and explication of style, and such concepts can be taken from all four categories of text models.'

This means that the *sentence*-based models allow for the description of not only the grammar, syntax, vocabulary and so on of single sentences, but also of those aspects in the text which focus on the relationships between sentences and clauses and the ways in which these relationships and links are effected. The second type of text model mentioned by Enkvist deals with *predications* and how they, through a number of different text strategies, build and combine these predications into a comprehensive whole. The question of the relationship between 'style' and 'text strategy' also becomes an important factor here (see Enkvist 1985a:263-264). The *cognitive* text models are valuable in the sense that they enable us to link the formation, production and understanding of texts and the styles of texts to human cognitive processes. Lastly, the models which were termed by Enkvist as *interactional* models, provide valuable clues as to which factors on the interactional level influenced the choice of words and caused an utterance to be structured in a specific way.

Consequently, it seems rather important to recognize which text theory or model is the underlying model for the specific endeavor, as this, among other factors, will determine the legitimacy, extent, and scope of the specific description or understanding of a style. The failure of many researchers to clearly delineate the paradigm in which they are operating is one of the main reasons for the confusion in modern stylistics. Furthermore, the fact that all four of the text types identified by Enkvist can in some instances simultaneously be relevant, only serves to complicate the issue further. This results in the problematic use of the term 'style'. For some the scope is limited only to grammatical and lexical features while for others it includes everything that is held to be valid in literary criticism.

Another fundamental aspect which can have a great influence on the way in which style is approached and that definitely needs to be clarified, is the *purpose* or *aim* for the study of style. This will not only help to establish the parameters for the specific study, but will also facilitate a clearer definition of the elusive term 'style' in terms of the specific undertaking. For instance, if the study of a given text is undertaken with the purpose of establishing how the language works, then a structuralist approach will probably suffice. If the analysis is, however, undertaken with the purpose of discovering how the texts communicate, then other approaches must be included as the underlying reasons for the study of the text are much more pragmatic. In the latter case, quite a number of methods of stylistic analysis will come into play, but in the former case a much more limited view of style is sufficient. Leech (1985:39) in an article where he proposes to analyze a specific text stylistically, identifies two basic purposes of stylistic analyses within what he calls 'literary stylistics':

We may distinguish *DESCRIPTIVE* stylistics (where the purpose is just to describe style) from *EXPLANATORY* stylistics (where the purpose is to use stylistics to explain something). Again, within explanatory stylistics, we may distinguish cases where the explanatory goal is *EXTRINSIC* (e.g. to find out the author(s) or the chronology of a set of writings), or *INTRINSIC* (where the purpose is to explain the meaning or value of the text itself) [Leech's italics].

All this has the implication that in order to apply or evaluate a specific stylistic approach, the purpose or aim of such a study must be spelled out clearly.

To conclude, we can state that the vagueness in the use of the term 'style' is probably the root cause of the confusion regarding stylistics in general. It is the result of the incorporation of so many different fields of research and aspects of text analysis into stylistics subsequent to the 'merging' of these two disciplines which we have indicated previously. The only way to overcome this difficulty is to define the term 'style' sufficiently right from the start, and to define the underlying text theory, so that there can be no doubt or misunderstanding regarding the implications of the term. The definition of what style is, must also, of necessity, include a clear statement of the purpose of the study. In this way a more responsible and better articulated definition of and approach to style can be formulated.

Before we turn to the specifics of all the factors involved in the study of the style of John, it is necessary to explain the position regarding style taken for the purposes of this book.

1.3 Approaching a definition of style

In the light of the above, a definition of what style comprises, can perhaps be formulated as follows:

Style has to do with the *choices* available to users of language, and since these choices are determined by specific needs and circumstances, style is a *contextually determined* phenomenon. Because of this, style in effect deals with the *successful communication* of texts in context. Every aspect of language which facilitates this process of communication, therefore, has to do with the style of the text. This, however, does not mean that a general description of all the innumerable linguistic and literary features in a text, will amount to a description of the style of a text. Far from it. Only those features which facilitate the specific communication in that specific circumstance can be considered of stylistic value in this paradigm. The features in a text which facilitate this process should not be limited, and can vary according to the specific needs of a specific text or context.

This means that *only* the relevant facets and features of the linguistic and literary communication of that specific text need be considered. These will include aspects such as phonology, vocabulary, syntax, and grammar, and will

combine the basic principles of language with more comprehensive aspects such as text and discourse structure, semantics, social, literary and other contexts, and aspects pertaining to genre, intertext, and reception of the text. In short, the style of the text as a whole can only be adequately described by taking into consideration *all* these factors which influence the choices made in the text, and relate that to the actual choices made.

From this it should be clear that for the purpose of this book, style is considered in terms of all four of the text or discourse models identified above by Enkvist (1985a:262-263) seen in combination, because each model's presuppositions accommodate different aspects relevant to the successful communication of the text.

Together with this comprehensive view of style, the *purpose* of the study must also be stated clearly. In terms of the above argument it appears that, since we are *inter alia* considering the successful communication of the text, a mere *description* of the style will not be sufficient. We shall, therefore, concentrate our efforts on, in Leech's (1985:39) terms, *explanatory*, *intrinsic* stylistics, where our purpose is to explain the meaning/value of the text itself.

The *significance* of all these considerations for the study of the style of the Fourth Gospel and the *practical* implications of the implementation of the theoretical views must now be made clear, before we can proceed to an actual stylistic analysis of John.

2. *Style and John's Gospel*

As indicated in the previous chapter, relatively little has been done in the field of Johannine studies that can be classified as 'style studies' in the *modern* sense. There have been rapid advances and progression in modern literary theory and stylistic and linguistic study in general since the 1950s, but unfortunately Johannine studies have not really been influenced by modern approaches, with the exception of the work of Culpepper (1987) on narratology, Staley (1986a) on reception theory, and the literature quoted in chapter I. A few other titles dealing with *inter alia* irony (Duke 1984) and O'Day (1986), literary devices (Wead 1970) and a few other studies which deal with aspects of literary criticism, stylistic features and linguistics on a smaller scale (also see Van Belle 1988), are perhaps the only studies incorporating modern literary and linguistic theory in Johannine studies. Therefore it does indeed seem that the style of the Gospel has so far been approached on too limited a scale, despite the rapid advances of modern stylistic, linguistic and literary theory. An approach in which a combination of at least a few of these facets can be incorporated is also still lacking. This does not, of course, mean that classical style theory has become obsolete, but only that the insights of contemporary understandings of the way in which language functions should also be incorporated in our understanding of style. This is necessary because classical style theory deals

with language from a certain perspective only, and that this should be recognized, and other, more comprehensive alternatives should be explored.

In this regard, Louw (1986:5) is but one of many voices who calls for a more comprehensive description of Johannine style:

Johannine style has been discussed by some scholars mainly in terms of Semitisms and related grammatical peculiarities. Should these features be classified as stylistic, however? Other scholars have restricted their remarks to the relative absence of rhetorical figures of speech, such as advocated by the earlier Greek orators. But figures of speech are merely one aspect of style. Style involves a much wider range of items, for style pertains to an author's choice from among the various possibilities of expression offered by the language. Style also extends beyond sentence boundaries; it involves the structure of the total discourse.

Perhaps the virtual absence of the introduction of modern stylistics into the study of the New Testament can be ascribed to the fact that New Testament critics are not trained linguists or stylisticians and usually study texts and utilize methods pertaining to linguistics and language only to achieve other theological or exegetical goals. On the other hand it is also true that researchers in the field of stylistics, linguistics and literary theory are very seldom interested in using the Bible as the object of a study. Longacre (1985:169-185), Lanser (1988:67-84) and Hancher (1988:27-40) are some of the few exceptions in this respect.

It is also possible that the fact that the Bible is a religious object for many excludes the study of it in a way similar to other literary works. Another possibility is that the Bible, as a corpus of religious writings is not considered literature in the true sense, and it is, therefore, not introduced into the sciences of stylistics, linguistics and so on. A literary critic, although he might be a believer, would be primarily interested in studying 'real' literature, as he perceives it, rather than the Bible. There is thus a virtual one-sidedness in the study of the Bible as literature — it is primarily theologians, attempting a literary analysis of the Bible, that use the methodology. Very seldom is it the other way round — that a literary scholar will attempt a study of a book of the Bible. This could account for the fact that out of the multitude of literary, linguistic and stylistic theories available in modern scholarship today, very few have been introduced into the study of the Bible as literature, and of course, the Gospel of John. As mentioned above two marked exceptions are *narratology* and *reception theory* which are currently being employed by biblical scholars in general (see Watson 1988:45-56).

Bearing in mind the limitations of Johannine stylistics on the one hand and the possibilities of modern stylistic thinking on the other, we can attempt a possible delineation of the scope of this study. Our aim with this study can be seen as an attempt to introduce some of the results of modern linguistics, stylistics and literary theory into the study of John. Special attention is focused on the aspect of style, but style in the rather broad definition indicated above. Although the study of smaller units and even words will necessarily have to

come into play, attention will be given to a larger section of the Gospel to indicate how all the aspects we contend are relevant for understanding style, function in the text, that is, aspects on the lexical, sentence, and text levels. The Gospel of John can of course be studied for a variety of reasons, as we stated earlier, and with a variety of stylistic views. We have chosen to conduct the analysis of the Gospel with a view to describing *and* explaining the text (see Leech 1985:39).

It is perhaps also appropriate to deal here with the question of the applicability of *modern* literary theories to *ancient* texts. Vorster (1986:52-56), gives a very good indication of the problems regarding the literary character of the New Testament. He argues that New Testament scholarship in general emphasized the origin and growth of New Testament texts overly, and that this led to the denial of the literary character of the New Testament. However, according to Vorster (1986:57), 'there can be little doubt that Jesus was a storyteller and that early Christians transmitted and established their newly found convictions by retelling the story and stories of Jesus'. This means that the early Christian narratives share common features with other narratives, and that principles applicable to these are in fact also applicable to biblical texts. Gabel and Wheeler (1986:15), argues the same point, in stating that the Bible 'has its own existence as literature: It was composed, compiled, shaped, added to, edited, copied, translated, and interpreted in ways quite recognizable to literary scholars'. (See also McConnell 1986:3-18 and Culley 1985:167-200 in this regard.) The Bible is a product of human endeavor, and, as language and literature, it is susceptible to modern literary analysis, as long as the fact that it is an ancient document is constantly kept in mind.

Regarding the stylistic study of John's Gospel, we must also be aware that the identification and description of the function of certain stylistic elements are not without problems. This is a problem which we referred to earlier, that is, the problem of distinguishing between the really functional features, and all those features of a text which, by the use of linguistics and literary analyses can be identified and shown to exist in a text (which can be innumerable) and which are also depicted as *stylistic*. For the purpose of this particular study, we will concentrate on those features in a text which really facilitate the *communication process*, that is, features that make a difference in aesthetic and other effects on a reader of the text. This is relevant since we perceive that the nature of the Gospel of John is such that it is a text designed to communicate something to its readers. In other words, certain structural or grammatical features in a text can be isolated and identified, but the questions regarding their significance for the communication of the text are primarily the ones that need to be answered. General linguistic and literary features can of course be identified, but it must be queried whether these factors are necessarily important for the understanding and communication of the *specific* text, or if they are mere representations of how the Hellenistic Greek language functions in *general*?

Because the study of style as we explained it, has to do with the study of how meaning functions in a *specific text*, it is important to note that to study John's text as a text-system or to analyze the text in a way which merely describes how language in *general* functions, is not adequate. This is because the Gospel of John is not an isolated text, but is designed as a religious text to function within a *specific* community and socio-cultural context. The specific linguistic choices made must be related to the specifics of the text and context presupposed in the text of John itself.

In the light of the above, it can be stated that this study will attempt to describe the style of the Gospel in so far as it pertains to the specific meaning of the text and the whole of the specific communication process. Style in this sense does not mean only a few isolated features, but the taking into consideration of aspects such as modern linguistics, semantics, literary analyses, reader response criticism and sociolinguistics. This also implies that the study of the Gospel here necessarily would to a large extent be in the field of *pragmatics*, since we are dealing with texts which are designed for a specific function within a specific religious community and not a text as an object designed with some aesthetic or artistic aim in mind. The necessity of the recognition of this all-important aspect in New Testament studies, is stressed by Vorster (1987:385). I give my own translation of the original Afrikaans here:

The fact that language has a pragmatic aspect is one of the most important insights readers of the New Testament should take cognizance of. Because speakers are doing something with the language, it is necessary to keep the pragmatic function of the language of the New Testament in mind. Most of the texts of the New Testament are not first and foremost written to provide readers with information. These texts were probably written to move people to do something, for instance, to persuade readers and hearers to adopt a specific view of a certain issue.

The specific genre of the Gospel of John is also a factor that we will have to account for in the description of the style of the Gospel. The fact that it is a *narrative* text is of importance here and will necessitate the utilization of aspects from the concept of this literary science, and the way in which this literary notion is linked with other relevant theories in order to arrive at a more comprehensive approach. Schiffrin (1984:315) argues this same point strongly when she states that in analyzing a narrative/story the questions of how the story is opened, closed and the performance within a social interaction are now asked with a new purpose in mind:

These questions have certainly been asked — and answered — before. But they are being asked here with the hope that their answers will provide an impetus toward an integrated theory of discourse, in which the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of talk so contextualize one another that discourse itself can be said to be realized only through relationships between structures, meanings, and actions which are themselves framed by social and cultural meanings.

From the above, it is clear that we are approaching a very comprehensive treatment of the style of the Gospel. This necessitates a text theory in which all these factors can be accommodated to provide a basis for such an integrated and comprehensive view of style. This will allow adequate room for the specific features and intricacies of a religious document, such as the Gospel of John, which we discussed briefly above. This means that our text theory must be able to accommodate aspects of traditional grammar and syntax, classical rhetoric, discourse structure, narratology, reception theory, and sociolinguistics. In this regard the concept of *context* is rather important. By context we are referring to all the factors intratextual and extratextual (as far as they can be determined), that can have a bearing on the production, execution and understanding of an utterance, discourse, or work of literature. We are referring to aspects of a cultural, social, sociological and historical nature. Knowledge about these aspects, as well as knowledge about literary, linguistic, and genre conventions is also of great importance in this respect. The whole of the context implied by and in a work of literature must be taken into account. We have already indicated that because of the nature of the Gospel text and the view that style is a context-determined phenomenon, our approach is firmly situated within the field of pragmatic. It is within this discipline that we will try to discover not only how the language *means*, but how it *means in use*. This has certain implications which must be elucidated here in order to understand the choice of text or linguistic theory from which we will attempt our stylistic analysis.

This will also give us the opportunity of addressing some of the possible objections to such a comprehensive account of style. One such fundamental objection could be that the fields of pragmatic and that of a more formal grammatical approach to language and style are mutually exclusive. Regarding the distinctions between these two areas, Leech (1983:4) states:

Grammar (the abstract formal system of language) and pragmatics (the principles of language use) are complementary domains within linguistics. We cannot understand the nature of language without studying both these domains, and the interaction between them. The consequences of this view include an affirmation of the centrality of formal linguistics in the sense of Chomsky's 'competence', but a recognition that this must be fitted into, and made answerable to, a more comprehensive framework which combines functional with formal explanations.

The combination of what can be called 'competence' and 'performance' result in the formation of a new paradigm which is called by Leech (1983:4) a 'formal-functional' paradigm, where the interrelationship of both these aspects of language is observed but the distinctions also kept in mind. Leech (1983:5) proposes a number of postulates which define the *differences* between the two fields, which taken *together* constitute a single complex theory of language. For the sake of clarity we give a full account of Leech's postulates (P):

P1: The semantic representation (or logical form) of a sentence is distinct from its pragmatic interpretation.

P2: Semantics is rule-governed (= grammatical); general pragmatics is principle-controlled (= rhetorical).

P3: The rules of grammar are fundamentally conventional; the principles of general pragmatics are fundamentally non-conventional, *ie* motivated in terms of conversational goals.

P4: General pragmatics relates the sense (or grammatical meaning) of an utterance to its pragmatic (or illocutionary) force. This relationship may be relatively direct or indirect.

P5: Grammatical correspondences are defined by mappings; pragmatic correspondences are defined by problems and their solutions.

P6: Grammatical explanations are primarily formal; pragmatic explanations are primarily functional.

P7: Grammar is ideational; pragmatics is interpersonal and textual.

P8: In general, grammar is describable in terms of discrete and determinate categories; pragmatics is describable in terms of continuous and indeterminate values.

In the light of the above it should be clear that so far Johannine style studies have located primarily in the formal paradigm, while newer development necessitates that it should also include functional elements. With the above kept in mind, we must consequently decide on and choose a specific model to utilize in our study of the style of the Fourth Gospel. To my mind then, it seems necessary to try to establish whether there is a text theory within the field of pragmatics which is so comprehensive that it can accommodate some, most, or all of the aspects which we perceive as constituting an adequate description of the style of the text of the Fourth Gospel. We are in fact, looking for a theory that comes close to Leech's (1983:4) 'formal-functional' paradigm. It is the contention of this thesis that the text theory which is most suitable for our endeavor can perhaps be found in the so-called *Speech Act Theory* of language, since this particular theory can accommodate all the features of literary communication we deemed important for the study of the style of the Gospel of John. Speech act theory offers a very broadly based theory of language, in which the various aspects of the communication process, and especially the interaction between these aspects can be elucidated. Style of course involves much more than only speech acts, but the fact that speech act theory offers a very comprehensive approach to the understanding of how language and literature function, makes it a very useful point of departure in approaching style. The methodology and relevance of this specific theory of language and the applicability and suitability to the stylistic analysis of the Gospel will be explained in full detail in the next chapter.

Having established what the nature of our approach to Johannine style should be, a few further remarks regarding some general aspects of this book are also necessary.

First, because our approach is more comprehensive and tries to deal with the communication of the Gospel text as a whole, the Fourth Gospel *should* really be studied in its entirety. This is, however, for practical reasons, not possible in this book. Therefore a larger unit of text is used to enable us to adequately

elucidate the intricacies of the style of the Gospel by affording us the opportunity of studying minute aspects of style, as well as some larger structures. This will enable us to establish whether this theory can indeed yield the desired results.

Secondly, since the meaning of the Gospel is produced by the experience of reading it as a single complete whole, an approach which concentrates on small units or even strata in the text or which dissects different sources and identify different editions may be detrimental to the understanding of the text as a whole. The Fourth Gospel will thus be approached as a single unit of meaning where 'the experience of reading the text is more important than understanding the process of its composition' (Culpepper 1987:5).

Thirdly, this does not imply that the shift from a *historical* study of the Gospel to a *literary* study would in the end exclude all questions of a historical nature (see also Henaut 1990:304). As a product of the first century AD, the Gospel was meant to communicate and to change perceptions of reality. Therefore its use of language will indeed reflect this historical setting. In order to understand the communication of the language and imagery used in the text, and also to account for the stylistic choices, certain historical considerations will enter into the discussion. In this sense, the results of historical critical scholarship will be of value to our present approach. But considerations regarding the history or pre-history of the text are excluded from the discussion.

Fourthly, this implies that a specific surface text of the Gospel must be selected as a point of departure for the analysis. The story of Jesus according to John will be analyzed from the Greek text of the third edition of the United Bible Societies (1975). This also implies that text-critical and source critical factors are necessarily excluded from the current study.

To conclude this chapter: It should be clear from the above that what we are propagating is a long way from the style studies on John discussed in the previous chapter. It would seem that this more comprehensive view of what style is and how it functions in a text, could possibly be a bit more satisfying and rewarding for interpreters of the Gospel. It would also be an exploratory step in introducing a variety of modern text, linguistic, literary and stylistic methods into the study of the Fourth Gospel, which could help to propagate the view that scripture could and should be studied with the same methods that are currently applied to the study of secular literature. The introduction of modern methods of studying literature into biblical scholarship, especially in Johannine style studies, could indeed open new ways of understanding the way in which the authors tell their stories and how these stories are understood and read by their readers. It must be stressed, however, that this is an experimental approach, since it has not been attempted in connection with Johannine style before. Furthermore, it must be recognized that the approach followed here, is just one

possible way of approaching the style of a text — a more limited approach or an approach from another perspective would necessarily differ from this specific approach.

CHAPTER THREE

SPEECH ACT THEORY, STYLE AND JOHN 4:1-42: SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

1. Introduction

As indicated previously, the concept of style as we perceive it should include a description of the whole process of the communication of a text. For a better understanding of the style, the analysis should not focus on only a single or even a few aspects of the process, as was done previously in Johannine style studies. An approach which encompasses at least all the major constituents of the communication of a literary text and which allows in its descriptive apparatus for the accommodation of facets of both *linguistic* and *literary* approaches to language, would seem to satisfy the above-mentioned object.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, we believe that such an approach to language can be found in the theory called *speech act theory*, the details of which we will shortly discuss. This theory has been developed over the past three decades or so since its inception with the lecture series by J L Austin in 1955 entitled *How to do things with words*. Its implications will be explored in this thesis, specifically with reference to a pericope in the Gospel of John. With the help of this theory, discourses and dialogues in the Gospel (and of course the whole Gospel itself) can be analyzed in a way that allows for a much more comprehensive description of the style of the Gospel than was previously possible.

For practical reasons, the dialogue with the woman at the well (Jn 4:1-42) has been chosen as an example to show how many of the features of speech act theory can be utilized to obtain a better and more comprehensive understanding of the style of the Gospel. Within the framework of this theory, aspects of grammatical surface structure, syntax, semantics, context, implication, and reception theory, are all catered for, and are used in such a manner that their interrelationship and interdependence are taken into consideration in the description and interpretation of the text or discourse. In addition to this

speech act theory provides a way of talking about utterances not only in terms of their surface grammatical properties but also in terms of the context in which they are made, the intentions, attitudes and expectations of the participants, the relationships between participants and generally the unspoken rules and conventions that are understood to in play when an utterance is made and received.

(Pratt 1977:86)

Speech act theory has a number of advantages, which make it a very comprehensive and viable method of analyzing the dynamics of language communication, and this is essential in understanding the style of texts. We will point out a few of these advantages once the theory itself has been made clear.

2. *Speech Act Theory*

The study of the New Testament or the Bible in terms of speech act theory is by no means a new undertaking. For instance, Thistleton (1970), Aurelio (1977), Arens (1982) and Du Plessis (1985) all introduced aspects of speech act theory into the study of the parables. Jacobs (1985) and Snyman (1983) utilized the methodology in dealing with the text of 1 Corinthians, and volume 41 of *Semeia* (1988) was entitled *Speech act theory and biblical criticism*. However, as far as the study of the Gospel of John is concerned, with the exception of Wendland (1985) on a very limited scale, virtually nothing has been done to use this methodology in any way. There is, however, some indication that there are a growing number of New Testament scholars working with speech act theory. At the 1990 AAR/SBL Meeting in New Orleans, there were quite a number of papers dealing with speech act theory, *inter alia* Neufeld (1990) and Botha (1990b) who read papers dealing with the Johannine corpus. Although the works quoted above all in some way explain the basic concepts of speech act theory, it seems appropriate to also do so here for the following reasons:

Firstly, the descriptions so far, are contained in works dealing with other parts of the New Testament and would not necessarily come to the attention of Johannine scholars.

Secondly, since speech act theory is relatively new to the study of the Fourth Gospel, and since not many Johannine scholars are well informed regarding the precepts of speech act theory, it seems prudent to include a short description here.

Thirdly, speech act theory as such is a literary and linguistic discipline and is to some extent very technical. It is better not to refer theologians, who are not necessarily also schooled in linguistics or literary theory in general, to such a vast field of research without indicating to them the applicable aspects of this approach to language to their specific discipline.

Fourthly, since it is impossible to give a full description of all the technicalities and intricacies of the theory here, a brief description will possibly enable the reader of this work to judge the relative worth of this method without necessitating a study of the whole intricate field called speech act theory. Speech act theory can be a handy *tool* to assist the study of the New Testament, but it is not the Alpha and Omega, and therefore New Testament scholars need not be trained linguists in order to utilize this tool to supplement their study of the New Testament.

The following description is not an exhaustive discussion of *all* the facets of

the theory, but rather an attempt to introduce the reader to the basic concepts of the theory and to elucidate those facets that will come into play in the analysis of the example text.

2.1 *Sentences vs utterances*

Speech act theory deals with *utterances* and not *sentences*. Sentences are the object of the study of formal grammar and also of semantics, where they are perceived as abstract semantic and syntactical structures — abstracted from the real or pragmatic contexts in which they are uttered. Syntax deals with the grammar (in a narrow sense the syntactical structures) of the language, where sentences are seen as abstract entities assigned syntactic structure semantic content. Semantics deals with the meanings of these structures, or rather, possible or potential meanings, but again usually somewhat separated from a specific pragmatic context. Speech acts are much more related to the pragmatics of language usage — that is, utterances made in a specific context have a specific ‘force’, not necessarily related to the form of the utterance, but certainly distinguishable from it. For instance, the utterance ‘It is raining’, has that meaning, but the ‘force’ of the utterance could, depending on the specific context, be that the speaker is using it as, for instance, a *warning* not to get wet.

2.2 *Performatives*

When an utterance such as the one above, is made in a certain context, the speaker actually *performs an act*, as the well-known and often-quoted words of Austin ([1962] 1975:60) regarding the concept of the *performative* imply: ‘It [*the concept performative* — JEB] indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action — it is not normally thought of as just saying something.’ From this, it follows that to speak is to perform an act. This concept was introduced by Austin because not all utterances in language can be viewed in terms of true or false, that is, as mere *statements* or *constatives*. Austin proposed that in addition to constatives there are also *performatives* (the real speech acts) in language. The distinction between these two concepts is also, according to Austin (1975:47), a ‘distinction between doing and saying’. This means that whereas constatives can be judged merely in terms of being either true or false, speech acts or performatives are to be judged in terms of their success. Terms used for this evaluation are ones such as *felicitous/infelicitous*, *happy/unhappy*, *appropriate/inappropriate*, *effective/ineffective*, and so on (see Cloete 1984:2).

2.3 Locution, illocution and perlocution

The performative furthermore encompasses following *three possible acts*:

A locutionary act: this is the act of producing a coherent and acceptable grammatical utterance (eg: 'You're dumb!'). Within this locutionary act three additional acts occur. Austin (1975:92-93) distinguishes these acts as follows:

To say anything is (A.a) always to perform the act of uttering certain noises (a 'phonetic' act)... (A.b) always to perform the act of uttering certain vocables or words... in a certain construction, i.e. conforming to and as conforming to a certain grammar, with a certain intonation, etc. This act we may call a 'phatic' act... and (A.c) generally to perform the act of using that pheme or its constituents with a certain more or less definite 'sense' and a more or less definite 'reference' (which together are equivalent to 'meaning'). This act we may call a 'rhetic' act.

In analyses of texts, the locutionary act as such, is not usually studied. Speech act analysis concentrates on the illocution and perlocution. However, the study of the locution can be very fruitful, as Cloete (1984:9-10) indicates. In our analysis we have, because of the nature of the study, only devoted limited space to the actual study of the locution, and concentrated more on the illocution and perlocution.

An illocutionary act: this is the act of producing an utterance with a certain illocutionary force, such as greeting, warning, ordering, requesting and so on. Searle (1975) classified illocutionary acts into five classes: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations. For example, the sentence: 'You're dumb!' is a statement, but this locution is used for a specific purpose, which is to insult. The illocutionary force of this utterance is thus 'insulting'.

Since Austin (1975:151) and Searle's (1975, 1976) classification of illocutionary speech acts, there has been quite a number of proposed taxonomies of illocutionary speech acts. Bach and Harnish (1979:40-44) proposed four communicative categories: constatives, directives, commissives and acknowledgements, and two conventional categories: effectives and verdictives. Leech (1983:205-226) follows both Searle, and Bach and Harnish, but in his description of English illocutionary verbs remarks that, because it is rather difficult to categorize speech act verbs in a language rigidly, it means that for speech act theory:

- a. it is pointless to attempt a rigid taxonomy of illocutionary acts;
- b. it is, however, possible and illuminating to attempt a taxonomy of illocutionary verbs or illocutionary predicates; and
- c. it is reasonable to assume that on the whole, the dimensions of contrast which are significant for the definition of illocutionary verbs are also of relevance to the analysis of illocutionary activities.

(Leech 1983:225)

In our discussion of John 4, we will follow the basic categories proposed by Searle (1975), but we will concentrate mainly on the taxonomy of Bach and Harnish (1979:41-55) and to an extent employ some of the concepts of Leech (1983). However, the fact that there is no consensus as to the delineation of different categories or even the number of speech acts must at all times be kept in mind, a flexibility must at all times be observed.

A perlocutionary act: this is the act by which the speaker achieves certain intended effects in his/her hearer, in addition to those achieved by the illocutionary act. For example, by calling another person dumb, the intention of the speaker is to make the other person feel bad, or to hurt his/her feelings. It is aimed at the addressee with a specific reaction in mind. There is, however, a distinction between intended perlocution and real perlocution or reaction. If the speaker in our example intended to hurt the other person, then that is his/her intended perlocution. If the hearer interprets the remark in such a way that he/she does not take the speaker seriously, and assumes that he/she is joking, then the real perlocution differs from the intended perlocution. A word of warning regarding the concept of perlocution is raised by Cloete (1984:9) who states:

Literary perlocution is as old as literature itself... A peculiarity is that the literary perlocution can completely go against the illocution of the text — there is something like 'illocutionary' and 'perlocutionary fallacy', to translate the old 'intentional fallacy' in a new idiom. Again a point of concurrence with reception aesthetics [*My translation of original Afrikaans*].

However, speech act theory can offer some consolation to those who despair as to the use of 'intended perlocution' as a term. Intentionality has been considered to be a fallacy and not attainable at all in a text-immanent analysis of texts, especially in circles where a more formalist approach is practiced. However, without propagating intentionality in the irresponsible way previously done, speech act theory has something to say in this matter. Lanser (1981:68) states that although some meaning in a discourse will always remain ambiguous, it is significant that some kind of intentionality 'is built into the very definition of the illocutionary act. Every type of illocution carries a certain conventional intent... [*and*] conventions of language, when evoked, are evoked intentionally rather than accidentally'.

2.4 *Appropriateness conditions or felicity conditions.*

For a detailed discussion of these conditions Searle ([1969] (1977:66, 1976:2), and Bach and Harnish (1979:55-59) can be consulted.

One of the fundamentals of language is that to be able to communicate, the users of language need to share to some extent knowledge about context, rules of the language and rules of their verbal dealings with each other. Thus one of

the key concepts of speech act theory, according to Searle (1977:22), is that 'speaking a language is engaging in a rule governed form of behavior. To put it more briskly, talking is performing acts according to rules'.

Thus, in order to understand a verbal exchange and its specific manifestation in a specific context, it is necessary to identify the rules/conditions that are applicable to that specific situation and these must be met whenever people engage in such a communicative situation. There are some general rules, but specific situations dictate their own unique sets of rules in addition to these. If, for instance, a question is asked, the following appropriateness conditions for the illocutionary act of asking a question are indicated by Pratt (1977:82):

1. Speaker does not know the answer.
2. Speaker believes it is possible hearer knows the answer.
3. It is not obvious that hearer will provide the answer at the time without being asked.
4. Speaker wants to know the answer.

As users of language, people rely constantly on the shared knowledge of appropriateness conditions, and the assumption that these rules have been met, plays an important role in the success of the communication. The user of language must choose from the multitude of possible *forms* of his/her speech act, the most appropriate one for the specific situation. Equally important is the knowledge of certain rules which govern specific types of speech situations, which are important to understand to make the communication successful. These rules differ according to the relationship that exists between the speakers in a specific context. The illocutionary act of demanding implies that the speaker is in a position over and against the addressee so that he/she has the right to do so, or that he/she is in a position of authority. Whereas for the act of pleading, the appropriateness conditions require that the addressee is in the position of authority. It is this knowledge of appropriateness conditions valid within a specific context that enables speakers and addressees to distinguish between, for instance, 'That was clever!' as a compliment and as a sarcastic statement. Furthermore, appropriateness conditions are also important from a linguistic point of view, because they are 'a crucial component of the grammar of a language even though they represent aspects of an utterance which are not part of the explicit verbal structure' (Pratt 1977:83). This means for Pratt that the one-sided concentration of Chomskyan linguistics on syntax and phonology is rectified somewhat. These appropriateness conditions must be observed, and they determine to a great extent the framework and rules which regulate communication. This includes all rules and principles, both linguistic and extra-linguistic, which govern utterances and conversation. The following concepts, which are discussed here, can be considered to be part of this general concept of appropriateness conditions.

2.5 *The cooperative principle and maxims.*

These were identified by Grice in 1967 in a series of lectures entitled *Logic and Conversation*, which were partially published in 1975. For Grice (1975a), the important thing in language usage is the success of an utterance. For maximum efficacy, the speaker must keep to the cooperative principle. This implies that our communication is governed by 'a rough general principle which participants will be expected (*ceteris paribus*) to observe, viz: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk-exchange in which you are engaged"' (Grice 1975a:45). In addition, Grice proposes four maxims, or large, general appropriateness conditions that are normally assumed to be in force when any conversation takes place:

1. Maxim of *Quantity* — the rule is that a contribution to an exchange should be as informative as required not more and not less. 'Be economical.'
2. Maxim of *Quality* — a contribution should be true — it must not be intentionally false and nothing should be said if the necessary evidence is lacking. 'Be sincere.'
3. Maxim of *Relation*. 'Be relevant.'
4. Maxim of *Manner*. 'Be perspicuous.'

It must also be noted that whenever one or more of these is transgressed, the necessity of reconstructing the meaning of an utterance by implicature arises. Grice (1975a:49) lists a number of cases in which the CP (Cooperation principle) or maxims are deliberately not fulfilled. Three of these are not applicable to works of literature, but the fourth, that is, *flouting* a maxim, is important for literary texts, because it is the only possible kind of non-fulfillment in a literary speech situation. As we are dealing with the Bible as literature, this aspect is of extreme importance for our purposes. Grice (1975a:49) explains how the flouting or deliberate non-fulfillment of the CP and maxims can necessitate implicature:

He may flout a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfill it. On the assumption that the speaker is able to fulfill the maxim and do so without violating another maxim (because of a clash), is not opting out, and is not, in view of the blatancy of his performance, trying to mislead, the hearer is faced with a minor problem: how can his saying what he did say be reconciled with the supposition that he is observing the overall CP? This situation is one which characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature.

Whenever flouting has taken place, it is necessary to decode the utterance in order to make sense of it. We are in agreement with Pratt (1977:163) that, in

literature and literary speech situations, it is always the flouting of a maxim that is relevant whenever there is some sort of failure to fulfill a maxim. This means that whenever flouting has taken place, in literature it is always the intention that this situation is resolved by implicature. It must be stressed, however, that this fact is valid only for the communication between implied author and readers in the text; but it is, of course, possible that the fictional speaker or character is failing to fulfill the CP in the fictional (re)construction of a verbal exchange. This failure of a fictional character to observe the CP can even result in the breaking off or failure of the conversation on the level at which the characters are interacting. But the CP between implied author and readers is of course not violated, or rather the readers assume that it is not and 'it is this assumption which determines the implicatures by which we resolve the fictional speaker's violations at the level of our dealings with the author' (Pratt 1977:175). The flouting of the above listed maxims result in a number of so-called figures of speech such as metaphor, hyperbole, meiosis, irony and so on. In this respect speech act theory provides a novel way of looking at these phenomena and of explaining and identifying them.

It must, however, be kept in mind that the CP and maxims can of course be unintentionally non-fulfilled. In this case, the participants in a conversation assume that the CP is still being observed, but they have to deduct and infer meaning from what is said. These implicatures are called conversational implicatures and represent the various calculations we make in order to make sense of what is said. For instance, if the following exchange is considered:

A: *Are you coming alone?*

B: *What time is it?*

It could be that B is deliberately ignoring A's remark, or does not want to consider A's invitation. He could be deliberately avoiding A's statement and so try to change the subject. Or B could be implicating that he/she is seriously considering A's invitation, provided that the hour is not too late. It is clear that more than one explanation of B's reaction is possible. This concept is frequently used by authors (and speakers of language) who are interested in exploiting multiple meanings, such as the Gospel of John. But the fact remains that the CP is considered as still being observed, and thus, by implicature, it is possible to understand exactly what the writer or speaker is implicating.

Implicature where the CP is considered to be observed is also important in narrative texts as far as causal and chronological sequence can be established by this. Speakers seldom supply full information or detail with regard to this, and the sequence must be determined by implicature. It would be useful for readers if a storyteller would give full details as to which expression is part of the background information, which is evaluative, and which is part of the narrative sequence; but this would make an act of communication very cumbersome and unattractive. This is why most narrators rely on implicature to convey the relevance that can be ascribed to any specific unclear expression.

In addition to the four maxims introduced by Grice (1975a), together with the general cooperation principle, Bach and Harnish (1979:64) introduced two more: the *maxim of politeness* and the *maxim of morality*, and describe these as:

Politeness (PO): The speaker (in speaking) behaves politely, that is, *S* is not offensive, abusive, rude, vulgar.

Morality (MO): The speaker (in speaking) behaves morally, that is, *S*:

- i. does not reveal information he ought not reveal,
- ii. does not ask for information he shouldn't have,
- iii. does not direct *H* to do/tell something *H* shouldn't do/tell,
- iv. does not commit himself to do something for *H* that *H* does not want done.

Bach and Harnish (1979:68) also propose a general *principle of charity*, which states: 'Other things being equal, construe the speakers remarks so as to violate as few maxims as possible.'

Finally Leech (1983:7-17) in adding to and extending Grice's 1975 scheme, proposes two different sets of conversational principles/maxims which govern any goal-oriented speech situation: the level of *interpersonal rhetoric* and the level of *textual rhetoric*. The principle distinctions are called *principles* and the subclasses are called *maxims* and *submaxims*. Leech's (1983:16) taxonomic layout is reproduced in a slightly altered form below. It is necessary to give a full representation here, because of the importance of this taxonomy for our analysis of John 4:

INTERPERSONAL RHETORIC

Cooperative Principle (CP):

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Maxim of Quantity | (sub-maxims) |
| Maxim of Quality | (.....) |
| Maxim of Relation | (.....) |
| Maxim of Manner | (.....) |

Politeness Principle (PP):

- Maxim of Tact
- Maxim of Generosity
- Maxim of Approbation
- Maxim of Modesty

.....
Irony Principle

TEXTUAL RHETORIC

Processibility Principle:

- End-focus Maxim
- End-weight Maxim

.....
Clarity principle:

.....(maxims)

Economy Principle

.....
Expressivity Principle

.....

A full and detailed description of the singularities of Leech's approach, methodological presuppositions, and a full discussion of his taxonomy of different principles can be found in Du Plessis (1985:16-22), but for our purposes, Leech's taxonomic outline is enough. The different taxonomies of principles/maxims we referred to above rather tend to overlap and are extensions of one another. In our approach, the classification offered by Leech (1983:16, 79-151) has mostly been used because of its more comprehensive nature.

2.6 *Shared knowledge, beliefs and presumptions*

These aspects are of cardinal importance in speech act theory. In the communication process a hearer/reader of an utterance depends not only on the utterance itself to make sense of what the speaker/author is saying, but also on contextual knowledge which both parties share. This shared knowledge determines to a great extent the understanding and interpreting of an utterance. Stylistically speaking, it is important to note how an author/speaker utilizes these extra-linguistic beliefs in his/her program of communicating with his/her readers. Bach and Harnish (1979:5-6) call this shared knowledge '*mutual contextual beliefs*' (MCBs). Facets which are important in this regard are: knowledge of the specific speech situation, social knowledge, knowledge of traditional beliefs and presuppositions, cultural knowledge, knowledge about relationships between parties, the implications of the relationships, and so on.

In addition to this there are a number of presumptions which both the author/speaker and the reader/hearer must share in order to make communication possible. The *linguistic presumption* (Bach & Harnish 1979:7) is the presumption that both parties are acquainted with the language and that both are able to handle the language adequately. The *communicative presumption* (Bach & Harnish 1979:7) is the presumption that when the author of an utterance is saying something to another party, 'he is doing it with some recognizable illocutionary intent'. The *presumption of literalness* (Bach & Harnish 1979:61; Du Plessis 1987:204) is the presumption that as long as a speaker's/author's utterance can be taken literally, it will be. If a hearer/reader, however, becomes aware of the fact that the intention is that he/she should not take the utterance literally, the non-literal meaning of the utterance should then be established.

The above is, of course, of cardinal importance in establishing what the exact meaning of non-literal speech acts are. This knowledge forms the basis on which the inference as to the exact meaning and intention of an utterance is made.

2.7 *Indirect speech acts*

Many speech acts are indirect speech acts — that is, many speech acts do not have a literal illocutionary force. If the illocutionary force cannot be determined by either the performative verb or the form of the utterance, then we have an indirect speech act. For instance, the sentence 'Can you get me something for the stove?' the sentence has the literal illocutionary force of a question. It has, however, the indirect illocutionary force of requesting. However, the problem arises that often an utterance is unmarked by both form or explicit performative verb with regard to its illocutionary force. (See also Huddleston 1976:128-129 and Stubbs 1983:158 on this.) The problem is how to determine the exact meaning of the utterance without an indication of what illocutionary force is at stake. This seems to be an as yet unresolved problem in speech act theory (see Van Jaarsveld 1987:8). Leech (1983:37-39) severely criticizes this concept of indirect speech acts, and argues that his problem-solving strategy and the resultant implicatures arrived at, correspond to Searle's indirect speech acts. For him all acts can be described as indirect speech acts, and this necessitates his distinction.

2.8 *Literary works and audiences*

In a natural speech situation there are a number of 'rules' governing the participation and non-participation of the parties involved. Rules such as turn-taking, length of utterance, and obligations to non-speaking participants are all important in a natural speech situation (Schlegelhoff 1973:12-14). Especially in public debates equal access rules apply. However, in situations where something is narrated or when the right to participate in a speech situation is given up, such as by attending a public lecture, then an audience is created, and notably a voluntary audience. This audience is held captive by the speaker, because they cannot just interrupt, correct him/her, add on, change the subject or leave without seriously breaking certain fixed rules of behavior. But the fact that the audience has given up certain privileges also implies that the speaker has a number of added obligations placed on him/her by the audience. He/She must ensure that his/her contribution is worthwhile, and a good one that keeps his/her audience's attention. The audience is therefore justified in expecting more of a speaker in this situation than in a situation where they can freely participate. In non-literary speech situations, one often finds that after the act of the speaker, the audience has time to pass judgment on what has occurred while they could not participate — this could be by criticizing, applauding, expressing disgust by throwing objects, question periods, and even silence. The fact that some kind of judgment is passed indicates that more than usual was expected of the speaker, and that he/she should have justified, in some way, the privileged position he/she was placed in at the start.

This is also true of the literary speech situation. The readers of a text knowingly and willingly enter into a situation in which the speaker has unique access to the floor. Thus the audience-speaker relation also comes into play in literary texts with obligations to both sides and a commitment to one another. Readers feel and expect that the writer is under an obligation to make their attention worthwhile and thus are willing to allow the writer some freedom and to bring their own behavior into line with what can be expected of an audience. This is equally important for ancient texts, and the exact relationship between speaker and audience in a specific time and context, and the specific rules observed in that context for the speaker/audience situation, implied in the text, must be determined. Aspects such as genre and so on come into play here as well.

The assumptions made by the readers (ancient and modern) at the beginning of the reading process are also important, as well as the care taken by some authors to reassure their audiences. The selection and preparation that went into the formation of the text are also important presuppositions we bring to bear when a literary work is read. This can indeed play an important part in the interpretation and reception of a text. (See Pratt 1977:116-125, 170 for an extensive discussion of this aspect.)

2.9 *Literary speech acts as 'display texts'*

Pratt (1977:132-151) argues strongly for the characterization of literary texts as 'display texts', because of the principles of assertability and tellability (interesting and new information) which come into play when narratives (natural or otherwise) are represented. A speaker, when making an assertion whose relevance is not merely informing, but also tellability, is

not only reporting but also verbally *displaying* a state of affairs, inviting his addressee(s) to join him in contemplating it, evaluating it, and responding to it. His point is to produce in his hearers not only belief but also imaginative and affective involvement in the state of affairs he is representing and an evaluative stance toward it. He intends them to share his wonder, amusement, terror or admiration of the event [Pratt's italics].

(Pratt 1977:136)

According to this argument, some literary narrative texts can be classified as 'display texts' with the purpose of verbally representing situations, experiences and so on which are of an unusual or problematic nature. The story or narrative is then related with the aim of inducing the audience to react in the intended way and to adopt the intended viewpoint and subsequently to participate with vigor in the whole experience represented and (re)created in the literary work.

2.10 *The literary speech situation*

It is the contention of this work that literary works are also speech acts, and that most, if not all, principles that are relevant to speech act theory regarding natural narrative also come into play when a literary work is read. In the literary speech situation, the communication between the speaker and the addressee can also in literary terms be described as a conversation that is taking place between author and reader. But it can only become a conversation if there is some sort of reaction on the side of the addressee. He/She must cooperate in order to constitute a valid literary conversation. It is therefore important also to keep the concept of Grice's (1975a:45) cooperation principle and maxims in mind when dealing with a literary work. Whenever one of these CPs is transgressed, certain implications arise which must be resolved. If these are not resolved, the consequences are that even the literary speech situation could be in danger of breaking down — that is, inducing the reader to stop reading and close the book. But the main implication from the above is that within speech act theory the literary communication process is seen as a *conversation*.

This is, however, not a simple undertaking and the fact that in literary communication the situation is somewhat more complex must at all times be kept in mind. Ricoeur (1973:97) states that:

in spoken discourse... the subjective intention of the speaking subject and the meaning of the discourse overlap each other in such a way that it is the same thing to understand what the speaker means and what his discourse means.... With written discourse, the author's intention and the meaning of the text cease to coincide. This dissociation of the verbal meaning of the text and the mental intention is what is at stake in the inscription of discourse.... The tie between the speaker and the discourse is not abolished, but distended and complicated.

The complex nature of the communicative situation in literary text is related to the fact that there is communication and conversation on different levels. Within a literary work and especially in a narrative, there are quite a number of levels on which the literary conversation takes place, and which have different participants, different speech acts, and different aims at each level.

Within a narrative literary work, the following participants are involved:

First, the real or concrete author and concrete addressee. Both these stand outside the text and the literary work and are thus not part of the literary enquiry.

Secondly, there are the abstract author and reader, also called the ideal or implied author and reader. Both are evoked by the narrative.

Thirdly, we find the narrator. This is the voice that tells the story. He/she addresses himself/herself to a narratee or fictional reader. Whereas the abstract or implied author operates within the literary work, the narrator is part of the represented world — the total world of the literary work. The

represented world is what the implied author presents the implied reader with. The narrator presents the narratee with the narrated world, which is inhabited by personations or characters, the fourth level.

Fourthly, the personations or characters also communicate with each other. They are present in the narrated world and have to do with the cited world, which consists of what a character says, believes and does.

The above distinctions between and delineation of the participants in a narrative communicative situation are basically based on the model of Chatman (1978). Staley (1986a:36-89) also uses this basic scheme and gives a full discussion of each of these facets in narrative. Schmid (1973:29), Carter (1988:57) and Watson (1988:50) offer *schematic* representations of the literary communicative situation. There has been some critique regarding terminology and concepts such as the implied author. Harley (1987:61-63) gives a good account of the differences in terminology regarding these terms as they are utilized by Schmid, Bal and others. Staley (1986a:47-54) also deals with inter alia the objections raised by Bal (1981). In this book we will be following the basic distinctions of Chatman (1978) and of Staley (1986a) regarding the concept of the implied readers and implied author.

Because of the existence of these different levels, different participants may react differently to the same speech acts. The implied reader could for instance react independently and differently from the narratee or a character. This is because each participant is involved in a different speech act/conversation from the others. Furthermore, it must again be stressed that, just as a live conversation between two people is not conducted out of context, the context of the literary speech act must also be taken into consideration. Because of this fact certain felicity conditions or appropriateness conditions valid for the historical situation and participants, and the conventions applicable for each level of communication, must be kept in mind (see Givon 1979:226).

We have already referred briefly to genre, but in this context the importance of genre and the knowledge of genre must be stressed. The nature of the text and the knowledge of the nature of the text implies that certain rules are at play. The act of reading implies that the reader to some extent places some expectation on his/her reading. He/she expects certain things from certain types of texts.

In sum, in order to account for the full range of implicatures for which the reader of a literary work is responsible, a description of literary speech acts will ... have to take into account both the CP and maxims as defined for the works genre and the CP and maxims as defined for the fictional speaker's utterance. While only the latter are required to decode what the fictional speaker is saying, both sets of appropriateness conditions are required to decode what the author is implicating. Readers of fictional literary works... automatically distribute their expectations in this way.

(Pratt 1977:203)

It is the task of the author (or implied author, rather) to supply the necessary and relevant 'signs' to lead the reader to interpret the speech act correctly. This is sufficient to conclude our very brief outline of speech act theory and the way it can be applied to literary texts. Other more detailed aspects of the theory will be dealt with when and if they come into operation in the analysis of John 4.

For detailed discussions of speech act theory in general, the following are useful as reference works: Pratt (1977); Bach and Harnish (1979); Lanser (1981); Leech (1983); McLaughlin (1984); Cloete (1984); Van Jaarsveld (1987); and White (1988). For discussions of aspects of speech act theory, see Lanigan (1977); Van Dijk (1972); Wierzbicka (1980); Van Jaarsveld (1982 & 1987); Van Coller and Van Jaarsveld (1984); Bax (1985); Felman (1983); and Van Eemeren and Koning (1981).

3. *Some advantages of Speech Act Theory for the study of style*

In this section, we mention a few of the advantages of the utilization of speech act theory in the stylistic analysis and description of (biblical) texts. This will explain to some extent the emphasis speech act theory will receive once we start with the actual reading and analysis of our example text.

3.1 *The concept of utterances*

A first advantage of the theory is that since it emphasizes the concept of utterances, it provides not only for detailed analysis of a *single sentence utterance* (which can be a one-word sentence) but also for the *multisentence utterance* and indeed for the whole of a discourse or even the whole of a work of literature. In all these instances, all the basic principles of speech act theory still come into play and are therefore applicable. Because of this fact, it is a handy tool especially for biblical scholars who very often concentrate on very small units of language in their interpretations. But if the unit needs to be enlarged it can be done without change in the basic approach or methodology. The style of a single utterance and that of a whole discourse can be studied and described in the same way.

3.2 *Literary texts and verbal interaction*

Also advantageous in a literary speech act approach to texts is the fact that this theory treats literature and literary texts the same as any other type of verbal interaction. This means that literary language can be described and defined with the same descriptive apparatus as all other types communication. The problematic distinctions between the so-called 'ordinary' and 'poetic' language are no longer valid distinctions in the study of style (see Pratt 1977:88 and also Fowler 1977:47).

3.3 *Importance of context*

Also of note is another basic aspect of the theory, that is, the fact that the *context* of an utterance is of extreme importance, that is, the historical, social, cultural, the speech situation, and even the literary context. This is most important for the description of style. The way in which a certain utterance/text is produced, and the way in which it is received and understood depends very much on the *context* of the speech act and on the knowledge of the rules, expectations, conventions and practices of the specific society represented in the text. How the author uses these concepts in the formation and structuring of his/her text, is indicative of his/her style. This is all, of course, culturally shared knowledge and thus it is extremely important to be well versed in the cultural context of the utterances or discourse, that is, the mutual contextual beliefs (MCBs). The necessity of knowledge about these for the interpretation and description of the style of ancient biblical texts is obvious. However, it must be stressed here that our knowledge of the context of the texts of the Bible is at best, rather inadequate. We can but postulate and reconstruct a context, and never insist on having the actual context available to us. The work of literature itself sometimes implies a certain context which can offer us some assistance in this respect. The fact that there is within speech act theory acknowledgement of the importance of the context of an utterance, and the utilization of this knowledge in the interpretation of utterances, is one of the factors that makes speech act theory very useful in the determination of the style of a document, such as the Gospel of John. The problem with ancient texts is of course that we know so little about their contexts, and this will necessarily demand that our observations are not apodictic but cautious and open for revision.

3.4 *Rule-governed behavior*

One of the key elements in speech act theory is the postulation that all language communication is governed by rules. Depending on the context of an utterance, certain *rules* come into play. These rules (also called appropriateness conditions), govern the whole of the speech situation. These concepts of appropriateness conditions that 'provide a way of building into the description of an utterance the contextual norms... so that style in any kind of discourse can be represented as the context-dependent phenomenon it is' (Pratt 1977:87; see also McLaughlin 1984:13-29).

This enables a discussion of style in terms of the way in which the author uses these rules, the deviation from or transgression of the rules, and so on for a specific purpose. In this way, other aspects which have hitherto not played a part in the description of style, can now be introduced to shed additional light on style. For instance, aspects such as frequency of rule violation can now also come into play in determining style. Important for the study of New Testament

texts is the question of genre, especially in gospel studies. With the help of the concept of appropriateness conditions, genre and subgenre can be depicted as systems of appropriateness conditions, and could perhaps be useful in future descriptions of genre as this would provide avenues of viewing genre that are as yet unexplored in biblical scholarship.

3.5 *Speech act theory and reception theory*

The very important use in New Testament studies of *reception theory* and the implications thereof for the interpretation of New Testament texts, is also to some extent accounted for in a theory of speech acts. The basic presupposition in speech act theory is that a person engaging in a speech act performs not only a locutionary act (producing a valid grammatical utterance) but also an illocutionary act (producing an utterance with a specific illocutionary power such as an order, a warning, a request, and so on). In addition to these two acts he/she can also perform a *perlocutionary act* (achieving certain effects in his/her hearers, for example, by promising he/she may be warning somebody off).

The concepts of illocutionary acts and, especially, perlocutionary acts make the theory very suitable for the pretexts and principles of reception theory and offer the opportunity of including aspects of this in the description of the style of a text. Cloete (1984:9) remarks:

Finally, there is also a perlocutive approach to, dealing with, or reading of a literary work. In other words: literature is read and used with the aim of achieving a certain goal in reality, of applying it, and using it pragmatically — educationally, politically, religiously, therapeutically and so on. But, the perlocution is also affixed by the reader to the work of literature or even forced upon it; to put it more clearly: the literary perlocution is an act of the reader, a contribution by the reader. For literary reception-aesthetics it is an important factor to take cognizance of [*My translation of Afrikaans original*].

3.6 *Implicature*

In speech act theory the concept of implicature is a very important notion, as we showed in the previous section. In short, implicature involves the calculations and interpretations the hearer/reader of an utterance applies to this utterance to determine its meaning. This can happen on every level of the language, such as the level of syntax, semantics, and so on. For instance, the grammatical construction of the ellipsis, necessitates the furnishing of the referent from the context, as do certain pronouns. On the semantic level, the utterance 'You must have dinner with us!' can only be understood as an invitation and not as a command, because of the rules of implicature. This is very important for the study of style, because speech act theory makes it possible to explain the process of how certain meanings are arrived at. This is not to say that these meanings

were not arrived at previously, but speech act theory has the descriptive apparatus to describe the whole process which was previously only 'sensed' and 'intuitively felt' by literary critics. Lanser (1981:76-77) explains the benefits of this notion as the confirmation of the theory that language communicates both through and between words, and thus 'provides a tool for acknowledging, naming, and studying the "gaps" in discourse — the unspoken assumptions and messages upon which meaning depends'. Lanser (1981:77) further argues that much of the communication of a text is not actually said or written and this 'requires us to expand the very notion of "text" from the formalist vision of words-on-a-page to the speech act focus upon a verbal performance whose "variable meaning-potential" is determined "by specifying co-texts and contexts"'.

3.7 *Appellative power*

Cloete (1984:11) also adds that the concept of speech acts provides additional ways of approaching aspects of literature, and quotes Austin (1975:63) in stating the advantage of the speech act theory in determining the appellative power of the *he* or *I* in a work of literature:

If I utter the words 'I bet...' , I do not state that I utter the words 'I bet...' but I perform the act of betting; and sincerely, if I says he bets, ie says the words 'I bet', he *bets*. But if I utter the words 'he bets', I only state that he utters (or rather has uttered) the words 'I bet': I do not perform the act of betting, which only he can perform: I describe his performances of the act of betting.

3.8 *Speech act theory and narratology*

Speech act theory also complements the narratological construct of the narrator in narrative texts, because concepts such as illocutionary force and implicature address additional aspects such as 'attitude', 'distance', 'affect' and 'tone', which the formalist theories were unable to provide tools for. In this regard Lanser (1981:79-80) states that other aspects such as the speaker-text relationships are made accessible by the concepts of speech act theory (and consequently also available for stylistic description). She also argues that characters in the text are created by being assigned illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. In this way the so-called 'process of semantic accumulation' is in effect 'the reader's construction of a world and personae capable of "housing" the illocutionary and propositional acts which the text generates both explicitly and by implicature' (Lanser 1981:80).

3.9 *Appropriateness conditions*

Another important advantage of speech act theory for the study of style is that the concept of appropriateness conditions as it is applied in this theory serves as

a corrective to some aspects of generative linguistics and grammar. Speech act theory states that appropriateness conditions are an essential part of the grammar of a language. Linguistics, from a generative point of view, focuses almost entirely on grammatical rules, syntax and phonology, with the result that style is also considered only in these terms. However, speech act theory necessitates a more elaborate description of how language works. Pratt (1977:84) remarks that not only the description of how a grammar works is necessary, but also a description of the 'ability to handle possible linguistic structures appropriately in specific contexts' (Traugott 1973:6).

3.10 Interpersonal relationships

An insight of speech act theory which also greatly enhances the insight into the communication process of literary texts and their style, is the notion that there are certain relationships between the participants in any communication process. This means that the description of language and style is now also placed in the sphere of human interaction, where the relationships between participants in conversation often dictate the linguistic forms used and have an influence on the way in which an utterance is structured. All these aspects have an influence on the style. Speech act theory has opened the way for students of style to consider vocabulary, grammar, syntax, semantics, and so on in terms of the interlocutors and their relationships.

3.11 The success of utterances

The fact that in speech act theory, the *success* of an utterance is considered to be of prime importance, provides a new way of looking at style. The style of document can now be expressed in other terms than that of conforming to a certain norm or model, of being rigid, elevated, and so on. Terms like 'functional', 'successful', and 'appropriate' can also be shown to be relevant in a description of style.

3.12 The author's obligations

We have also indicated that in speech act theory it is important to recognize that authors and readers are aware of the author's indebtedness towards his/her readers. Style of documents can also be considered in terms of how this situation is perceived and handled.

3.13 Rules and rule-breaking

Because of the notion of rules and rule-breaking in speech act theory, this also opens new ways of delineating style. Aspects such as frequency of rule

violation, specific rule breaking, and so on can become important factors in style analysis.

3.14 Context and style

The importance of the *context* in the communication process is one of the fundamentals of speech act theory. Considerations regarding style must necessarily also focus on this. The role of contextual matters, the exploitation of such matters, resultant appropriateness conditions and so on are all factors which contribute to, and determine the style of a specific document.

In conclusion, it can be noted that with regard to the study of *style* of texts, it appears that speech act theory on the whole has such a comprehensive approach to language usage that much of what can be considered stylistic is indeed accounted for, since speech act theory describes the whole of the communication process from the phonetic level to the level where the structure of the whole utterance becomes important. The special utilization of words, phrases, concepts, symbols and so on, determines the way in which the utterance will communicate and since style is the description of the way in which the text communicates, and how the author uses the language to achieve certain communicative aims, speech act theory is a very useful vehicle for describing this whole process. Furthermore, the fact that speech act theory employs so many concepts of narratology, reception theory and literary analysis, in general makes for a comprehensive arsenal of useful tools for describing the style of the text in terms of what is happening there, and also the pragmatics of the text.

4. John 4 as literary speech act

Having discussed the theory of speech acts and some of the most obvious advantages of this approach for the study of style, it is perhaps advisable to turn to the Gospel of John itself and try to establish how this theory can be applied to it. In the next chapter, we will offer a detailed analysis of the pericope we have chosen to examine. In this section, we will be establishing some of the general principles and presuppositions such a detailed analysis in speech act terms requires, such as the levels of conversation, participants and general felicity conditions governing not only the specific pericope, but the whole of the communication of the Gospel.

4.1 Levels of analysis

In analyzing a specific narrative text as a speech act, it must be kept in mind that there are possibly quite a number of levels on which something is being done by the utterances. It must be determined which levels come into play in

order to determine the extent of the speech act, since in a narrative text not all the possibilities are realized at the same time. It is outside the scope of this study to analyze the real communication between the real author and the real readers — ancient or modern. The chief aim of this study is to analyze the style of the Gospel, and especially that of chapter 4:1-42, as a *literary work*. It is therefore, not practicable, if at all possible, to address the issues concerning the real author and readers in a literary critical analysis. (See Chatman 1978:267 and Culpepper 1987:15. This is also illustrated by the fact that the person of the real author is very seldom part of the issue in modern reviews on books and other literature.) In this study, the focus is on the literary work as such and on the communication created by the literary work. Since we cannot deal with the concept of the real author(s) or readers, we deal with constructs of the text, such as implied author and implied readers (see the discussion on this in 2.10). The very good narratological analysis of the Gospel of John by Culpepper (1987) which was referred to in the first chapter, also deals with some of these concepts.

Culpepper (1987:15-17), when explaining certain definitions, equates the *implied author* with the *narrator* of the story and says that these two constructs are usually not distinguishable in the Gospel narrative. In a preface to the paperback edition of his work *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, Culpepper (1987:x) deals with critique received after the initial publication of this book in 1983. He refers to a dissertation by J L Staley (1986a) in which he (Staley 1986a:36-89) differs on a few points from Culpepper in his analysis and definitions of the implied author, narrator, narratee and so on. This could be of great significance in an analysis of the whole of the Gospel, and must definitely be taken into consideration when dealing with the Gospel as a *whole*. However, it would seem that Culpepper's statements concerning the concurrence of the implied author and narrator and the implied reader and narratee still have validity for the analysis of John chapter 4 (see Culpepper 1987:15-18, 205-211; Staley 1986a:47-67). In addition the critique by both Braun (1990:59-71) and Henaut (1990:287-304) also warrants further consideration, but since we are merely attempting to indicate that narrative analysis plays an important part of a comprehensive understanding of the style of the Gospel, we have not indulged in a discussion of a more narrative technical nature. We will, therefore, in our analysis of 4:1-42, follow Culpepper in not distinguishing between implied author and narrator and between implied reader and narratee. For a speech act theory reading of chapter 4, this would mean that the levels of implied author/reader and narrator/narratee coincide and can thus be analyzed as one. *For the purpose of this analysis, the terms 'author' and 'reader' used from now on, refer to the combination of implied author/narrator and implied reader/narratee.* Whenever we use the terms author or readers without any qualification, we are referring to these narratological constructs and never to real or flesh and blood instances. Regarding the implied reader, we agree with Lategan (1985:70) that

the implied reader represents the response the author is aiming at or assuming on the part of his audience. In this sense it functions as a heuristic device to uncover the meaning of the text. It is a theoretical construct to gauge the intended effect of the text. The implied reader is on the receiving end of all the various indicators of the text. He experiences the full impact of all the strategies employed by the author, integrates the various elements, and projects the ideal response to the text.

We can now continue to identify the levels which must be considered in analyzing John 4. The level of the implied author and reader is one of the levels on which communication takes place in the text and on which certain things are being done with the words of the Greek language. This is of course only valid for John 4, since as we indicated, Culpepper could be challenged on his premise that the two (narrator/implied author) cannot be distinguished throughout the narrative.

Another level on which something is being done with the words is on the level of the characters. The characters interact with one another, react, challenge, agree and so on. In this regard it is also important to note that these two levels we have identified, must at all times be clearly distinguished, because the perlocution on the level of the *characters* may be completely different from that of the *implied readers*.

4.2 *Types of speech acts involved*

Regarding the sort of speech acts involved on both the levels of communication, it should be noted that it is the contention of this thesis that *locution*, *illocution* and *perlocution* are involved here, on the level of the characters and especially on the level of the communication between implied author and readers. This is important because one of the presuppositions of this book is that religious texts have some purpose, that is, that it has pragmatic implications and thus is not only or chiefly interested in being an illocutionary act, *id est*, having some sort of intention or expressing some sort of intention, but it is chiefly a perlocutionary act, that is, it is meant to achieve some pragmatic aim with regard to its *readers*. Here the focus is on the readers in the text and not on the illocution of the text, and thus the text in itself. (See also Pratt's concept of a display text above under 2.9.) Cloete (1984:9), in a reference quoted earlier, indicates that literature is used with a definite pragmatic purpose in mind aimed at achieving a certain goal in reality.

We can thus conclude that John 4, as a *religious text*, is an example where something is being done with words. We know that Christian religious documents dating from the first century AD, functioned in this way (see Detweiler 1985 on sacred texts). It is therefore pragmatic in aim, and of a nature other than the illocutionary acts Austin (1975:126) describes as follows: 'Many illocutionary acts are not cases of trying to do any perlocutionary act; for example, to promise is not to try to do anything.'

Regarding the three speech acts involved in the whole of the communication process, the following needs to be noted. With specific reference to the locutionary act, the observations made by Austin (1975:92-93), quoted in 2.3 above, are relevant here. Bach and Harnish (1979:19-20) define the locutionary act and adapt Austin's views on this to show how the reader/hearer of an utterance reaches the meaning of an utterance. This is done by means of a whole intricate schema indicating the steps involved in arriving at the meaning of an utterance. Bearing in mind the scope of this book, it will be impossible to give such a full description of each step of the calculations involved in each and every locutionary act we encounter in the text of John 4. This means that in our analysis of the Gospel text, we will concentrate primarily on the illocution and perlocution of the utterances.

As we noted earlier, the locutionary act as such is in general very much disregarded in publications dealing with the literary speech act, perhaps because it is so basic a presupposition of the literary speech act. It is accepted that an illocutionary act presupposes a locutionary act. However, for the text of John or other ancient texts the perception of phonetic, phatic and rhetic acts could be important, because in the ancient world, texts were read aloud and thus the phonetic aspect was an important part of the communication. This also means that religious texts, such as the Gospels, were read aloud time and again in specific religious communities. However, this phonetic aspect which can be of great importance in interpreting and analyzing a specific text, is virtually lost to modern-day readers of ancient texts, because so little is known of the performance, pronunciation and actualization of texts read in public in ancient times. Regrettably, we only have the text as it is, in our editions of the Greek New Testament and thus can only analyze the texts from within using our linguistic and literary tools while accepting the sad fact that we only have a very limited perspective of the communication of the text and that some of this will forever be lost to us, because of our inability to (re)create the texts as the first real readers might have done.

4.3 *Some specifics of John chapter 4.*

The speech act, like the rhetorical act, not only is derived from a social situation, but is also a response to a social situation. The participants in that situation, speakers and hearers, form their language within a network of interacting relationships with themselves and other elements in their complex social and cultural context. The speaker does not perform the act of communication; rather, he participates in — he is a part of that communication — even as the hearer is also a part of that communication.

(Horner 1975:8)

If we agree with the above, then it is of primary importance to establish the nature of the speech acts in terms of the participants, their relationships within the text and the context in which the whole of the communication takes place.

All of which establish the rules governing this type of behavior. We have already established that there are two levels to be analyzed in John 4, that is, the conversation between the implied author and the implied reader, and the conversation between the characters in the story. These two levels and the participants, appropriateness conditions, relationships, and rules for conversation valid on each level, must at all times be distinguished.

4.3.1 *The character level*

The characters in John's story, although they represent characters in the real world are still creations of the author and what we know about them and their personalities is deduced purely from the text. For example, the Jesus presented to us in the Gospel of John is exactly that. Culpepper (1987:105-106) argues that 'we are dealing with Jesus as he is portrayed in the story, not with the historical person.... Characters are fashioned by what the narrator says about them, particularly when introducing them, what they say, what they do and how other characters react to them'.

In his narrative analysis of the Gospel of John, Culpepper (1987:106-112) gives a good analysis of the literary character of Jesus as it emerges from the Gospel as a whole. However useful this may be, it must be kept in mind that *our* speech act analysis deals with a specific pericope, which also functions within a specific literary context in the text; that is, the specific pericope must be interpreted in relation to the preceding information and also with reference to the subsequent events. Thus the linearity of the reading process must be kept in mind, if the speech act analysis is to remain valid. Up till this stage in the story, the author has only provided the readers with about three chapters of information with which they can try to understand the text. Rimmon-Kenan (1983:119-121) argues that this aspect of linearity can have a big influence on the interpretation of the text, and indicates how the progression from letter to letter, and word to word can influence the reader:

It also imposes on the reader a successive perception of bits of information even when these are meant to be understood as simultaneous in the story. Thus, placing an item at the beginning or at the end may radically change the process of reading as well as the final product.... Linearity can also be exploited to arouse suspense or deliberately mislead the reader by delaying various bits of information... and this too may cause him to construct meanings which will have to be revised at a later stage.

The amount of information available to the readers at this stage in the narrative must be kept in mind if one is to analyze the speech acts and their perlocutionary effects in the fourth chapter adequately. The good analysis of Jesus as presented by Culpepper is thus useful for the purpose of this study only in so far as it pertains to the character of Jesus and the presentation of the character in chapters 1-3. The same is, of course, also true for the character of

the disciples as a group which is discussed by Culpepper (1987:115-125). The other characters who interact in this specific scene, are the Samaritan woman and the people from the village.

If we look in a little more detail at the *character Jesus* as it is presented in the first three chapters, then the following seems to be important regarding this character's *relationship with the character of the disciples* in the story:

- * Jesus was pointed out to the disciples by John as the 'Lamb of God' (1: 36).
- * He was considered to be a rabbi (1: 38).
- * He was also considered to be the Messiah (1:41). They knew that he had foreknowledge about Nathaniel (1:48)
- * Nathaniel called him 'Son of God' and 'King of Israel' (1: 49).
- * He told them that they would see bigger things (1: 50,51).
- * He had shown his power in Cana and his disciples came to believe in him (2: 11).
- * The disciples witnessed the cleansing of the temple and remembered the scriptures and only later believed the scriptures and Jesus (2:17,22).
- * The disciples witnessed quite a number of miracles (2:33).
- * Jesus and his disciples spent some time in Judea baptizing people (3: 22).
- * Of all the disciples, only the first two, Andrew (1: 39) and Philip (1: 43), are called explicitly. The rest of the disciples follow because they were told by other disciples.

From the above, it is clear that there is a special relationship between Jesus and his disciples. They have a fair idea as to his identity; they have faith in him, although 2:22 could indicate that it was still not quite adequate; they follow him willingly; they witnessed a number of miracles; they connected his person with the Scriptures (2: 17); and they accepted him to be their rabbi. All of this knowledge about the relationship between Jesus and his disciples, establishes the rules of the conversation in which Jesus and his disciples are involved. It determines their *acts* as well as their *words* and determines the parameters in which the conversation develops, and any deviation from these established rules is therefore of significance. The context of the conversation between Jesus and his disciples is that of master versus pupil, of rabbi over and against his followers who believe him to be more than a mere rabbi. This relationship and the knowledge we have of the culture and implication of such relationships, are helpful in determining 'the general appropriateness conditions that participants in a speech exchange normally assume to be in force' (Pratt 1977:130). It is significant that the disciples address Jesus directly only once in John 4:1-42. Their actions and words are determined by their relationship to him. They do not question his actions (4:27), or demand explanations from him (4:33), even when he transgresses the maxim of manner (see also the analysis of 4:34-38).

The relationship between the disciples and the Samaritans is not clear in this passage. One can assume that the general negative attitude of Jews towards Samaritans is playing a role here, but very little specific information is supplied. The disciples are willing to buy food from the Samaritans, and eat it (4:8,32). They also stay over for another two days without any protests — despite the information supplied by the author that the Samaritans and Jews do not eat together. There is, however, no verbal exchange between them in the story.

The relationship between Jesus and the Samaritan woman calls for close attention because it constitutes the bulk of the pericope. This relationship develops dramatically as the conversation progresses but initially the following must be noted:

- * Jesus and the woman meet as complete strangers.
- * They encounter each other in a 'foreign' country; that is, Samaria.
- * There are allusions to the patriarchs and worship — shared knowledge between them.
- * Jesus is a *male Jew* — she is a *female Samaritan*. An impossible conversation in terms of the socio-historical context.
- * They are alone, which is also socially unacceptable.
- * Jews and Samaritans do not share cooking or eating utensils.

Because of the above it can be assumed that the following appropriateness conditions are valid for this specific conversation: The meeting is between two total strangers and when the conversation starts the Cooperative Principle (CP) is assumed to be observed. This immediately implies that the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner are being observed. These are the general maxims, but a number of other maxims of social or moral character can also be observed, such as politeness, shared historical and geographical knowledge, awareness of an underlying antagonism between Jews and Samaritans, knowledge of the religious divisions between them, rules of turn-taking, and the principles of interpersonal rhetoric (see Leech 1983:16). The different appropriateness conditions for each utterance must be analyzed and described individually, so that the different illocutionary acts can be differentiated (see also Searle 1977:54-71). Each speech act presupposes a number of appropriateness conditions for the act to be both valid and successful. Pratt (1977:82-83) mentions that in order to command, there is an appropriateness condition requiring that a speaker be in a position of authority, while pleading requires that the addressee is in an authoritative position.

While it is true that in the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman, these appropriateness conditions and rules of conversation are generally followed, it is not done so continuously. It is of course part of the nature of a literary work that the characters can be manipulated by the author to do or say things which are against all norms of conversation. This does not

mean that the conversation is breaking down as it would do in natural discourses, but that the author is deliberately *flouting a maxim* in order to implicate some meaning to the audience/readers. This the author of John 4 indeed does. A careful analysis of the conversation with the relevant appropriateness conditions, general rules for conversation and the specific rules applying to the specific socio-historical context is needed to establish the exact nature of the conversation. Aspects such as the social status of women and men, use of vocatives, forms of address, relationships between Jews and Samaritans, religious practices, morality concerning marriage, and so on are relevant here. The way in which the characters use language in terms of their sex, is also a factor that should be considered. However, very little has been done, and is in fact known about male and female speech in ancient times (see Gilleland 1980). But it must be stressed again that these rules are important for the conversation between Jesus and the woman as *characters* in the story. The appropriateness or not, of actions/words must be evaluated in terms of the rules for conversation on the *character* level.

The relationship between the *Samaritan woman and the people of the village* is significant in so far as they exchange only one sentence each with each other in different contexts. However, on the level of author and reader there are a number of significant aspects with which we shall deal later in the detailed analysis of the text.

4.3.2 *The level of the implied author and readers*

The above remarks were made regarding the level of the characters in the story, and their relationships. There is, of course, still the level where a conversation or discourse takes place *between the implied author and the implied readers*. The telling of this story is not being done without a specific purpose in mind, and in the reading of the story the relationship between the implied author and reader becomes of prime importance. In order to follow the strategy employed in John 4 to persuade the readers, the relationship between author and reader must be examined so that also on this level certain rules of conversation and conditions can be established. The *person of the implied author* in the Gospel of John as it emerges from the text is discussed by Culpepper (1987:15-49). While his viewpoint on most of what is said about the narrator seems to be valid, the views of Staley (1986a) regarding the reliability of the narrator could be of some significance in an overall analysis of the whole of the Gospel. Culpepper (1987:x) remarks that 'Staley argues that the narrator is not consistently reliable but is at times self contradictory and engages in a strategy of reader entrapment or reader victimization'.

The evidence for and against this view must be evaluated carefully, but for the purpose of this book only the evidence of how the implied author is presented up to chapter 4 is relevant. Evidence from the analysis of chapter 4

could indicate support for Staley's views, but we will return to this in the detailed analysis later. In general then, much of what Culpepper proposes regarding the implied author can be accepted as valid. The most important of these proposals is that he/she is the one who guides the reader through the narrative, introduces the characters and supplies the necessary information on how to interpret the action. Furthermore, the implied author as narrator is intrusive and self-conscious that he/she is speaking to an audience — the multitude of 'asides' or explanatory notes clearly indicates this (see Tenney 1960:350-351; O'Rourke 1979:210-219; Lombard 1987:395-413; Culpepper 1987:16-18). The author/narrator seems to be omniscient right from the start, he/she also appears to be omnipresent and would like to appear as reliable. It also appears that this author is well aware of his/her obligations toward his/her audience, because of the suspension of turn-taking system in the literary work. Pratt (1977:114) remarks that the role of the reader (implied or real) in a literary situation is very much like that of an audience, and this also has an influence on the communication between the author and the readers. The readers expect from authors to reward them with a worthwhile presentation, and authors are aware of this. 'From the beginnings of literature to the present, iconoclastic works of literature have often come to us accompanied by prefaces, built-in self defenses very much akin to the moderator's credentials list' (Pratt 1977:114).

It is thus clear that both readers and authors are aware that there are specific commitments which they have towards each other. It inevitably follows that this knowledge also shapes their way of communication. For instance, if we view the prologue of the Gospel, we find that in the past the purpose of the *prologue* was described in a number of ways. However, an examination of a list of different views on the nature of the prologue clearly indicates that the relationship between author and reader, and the author's knowledge of his/her indebtedness towards his/her readers have so far not played a part in interpreting aspects of the prologue. A few examples will illustrate this point:

Schnackenburg (1965:199; 1968:223) remarks on the purpose of the author of the prologue that 'the author certainly wished to give an account of Jesus's work on earth, as he saw it in faith (20:30f). But... he also wished to change the ordinary frame of reference and reveal to his readers from the very beginning the mystery of Jesus's origin'.

Bultmann (1957:1; 1971:13) argues that the prologue has, strictly speaking, very little to do with the rest of the Gospel, since the prologue contains no indication of the content or structure of the Gospel, nor does the author state the reason for his writing. The prologue is a complete whole in itself and necessitates no further completion. Yet 'the Prologue is an introduction — in the sense of being an overture, leading the reader out of the commonplace into a new and strange world of sounds and figures' (Bultmann 1957:1; 1971:13).

Both *Brown* (1982,1:18) and *Smalley* (1978:93) contend that the prologue's main purpose is to relate the Jesus-event not only to the historical situation, but also to prehistory and pre-existence. Staley (1986b:242) argues that the prologue, and especially the symmetrical shape of the prologue, has an influence on the shape of the whole Gospel structure.

From the above examples it is clear that the prologue to the Gospel so far is interpreted mostly in *theological* or *structure-indicating* terms, and *not* as part of an *act of communication* or *human interaction*. However valid these observations are, they do not account for everything in the prologue and do not explain the nature or the structure of the prologue adequately. Of course it is valid to say that the basic themes and information regarding the rest of the Gospel are given here, and that 'few things are more essential to appreciating a story than understanding the manner in which the narrator begins. Readers who misunderstand the beginning almost inevitably misunderstand the conclusion. At the beginning of a narrative, the narrator establishes the setting, introduces the characters, and lays the foundation for the plot' (Matera 1988:3).

Important as these insights are, the fact remains that the question of the function of the prologue in the whole of the Gospel, and its function with relation to the communication between author and reader is not approached at all. By utilizing some of the precepts of speech act theory, aspects of the Prologue which presented interpreters with difficulties can perhaps be explained more satisfactorily and the current views on the prologue can be supplemented to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the text. It is, furthermore, necessary to understand these aspects in order to satisfactorily grasp the dynamics of the conversation between implied author and reader. It is unfortunately, not possible to analyze the prologue of John's Gospel in detail here, but the following observations are important to illustrate the point.

First, the fact that the Gospel as we have it in its written form and that the author also acknowledges the fact that the Gospel is delivered in writing (20:30f) has certain implications for both author and reader. It means that the author had some time to plan and prepare the Gospel, to select certain events and stories, that errors and problems were to a great extent eliminated, and that the finished product in general is the best possible version of events and, therefore, worthwhile reading matter. 'It is partly for this reason that written compositions can make exceptional demands on their Audiences: they can be longer and more difficult to decipher than spontaneous, spoken discourse, especially if intended to be read rather than heard' (Pratt 1977:117).

The readers thus places a higher premium on the presentation and content of the communication and the author is aware of this. In the history of the reception of the Gospel texts, it is interesting to note how later readers and/or interpreters tried to supplement this implicit claim to reliability, authority, preparation, and selection of the text by adding the name of the author or supposed author and grouping the texts together in a normative collection.

Secondly, because the author is aware of this state of affairs, and the expectations of his/her readers, he/she is to a great extent observing the CP. For instance, the questions regarding the very brief introduction of John the Baptist and even the logos-concept can perhaps be answered if the maxim of quantity, which states, 'Do not make your contribution more informative than is required for the current purposes of the exchange', is taken into consideration. In addition, the whole question of implicature comes into play, and the different calculations the author expects the reader to make on the grounds of the premise that the CP is being observed, and the shared contextual knowledge. For instance, the author uses in 1:11 without any prior explanation the phrase 'his own (people)'. The readers have to supply the referents themselves.

Thirdly, it is also obvious that because of his/her indebtedness to his/her readers, the author is also trying to establish trust, benevolence, attention, goodwill and sympathy, that is the classical rhetorical features of *docilitas*, *attentio* and *benevolentio*. Stubbs (1983:152) contends that while the locutionary act was the traditional concern of linguistics, the perlocutionary act is closely aligned to traditional rhetoric: 'The perlocutionary act produces some effect on hearers. Persuasion is a perlocutionary act: one cannot persuade someone of something just by saying I persuade you. Comparable examples are convincing, annoying, frightening and amusing. This has been the traditional concern of rhetoric: the effect of language on the audience.'

The question now arises whether the implied author of John indeed used the above-mentioned traditional three rhetorical features to establish *rapport* with his/her readers. It seems that the author definitely has the *docilitas-effect* in mind because he/she gives a *summa causae* right at the beginning of the prologue. This immediately brings about the *attentio* because the essence of what is to follow, is to a great extent of cardinal importance for their existence here and now, as well as for eternity. Through all this the *benevolentio-effect* is also heightened. The subject matter, and the clear importance of it for time and eternity heightens the tellability and assertability of his/her message. Brinkman (1964:4-5), explores ways in which the prologue functioned in medieval Dutch texts with regard to the formal aspects of rhetoric, and mentions that *benevolentio* can be established in four ways: the author can try to gain sympathy for himself/herself, he/she can try to create antipathy against the enemies/opposition, he/she can try to influence the readers by stressing the meaningful and important aspects of their responsible choices, and he/she can make it clear that he/she is on their side helping them, while at the same time opposing the 'enemy'. An example from the prologue will illustrate this.

If one analyses the propositional acts in *John 1:9-13* it is clear that the instances *referred* to, although well known to the readers, are kept at a distance. The readers are not expected to identify with any instance in text. Hurford and Heasley (1983:248) argue that these propositional acts in utterances 'consists in

the mental acts of referring (to certain objects or people in the world) and of predicating (ie coupling predicates to referring expressions)'.

The author does not align himself/herself at this stage to one or the other possibilities in the text; that is accepting God/Jesus or rejecting him. However, in 1:14 he/she suddenly uses a first person pronoun ἡμῖν and the first person ἐθεασάμεθα.

Most commentators (for instance, Schnackenburg 1965:245; 1968:270; Brown 1982,1:13 and Bultmann 1957:33-34; 1971:62) take the ἡμῖν to refer to mankind in general. However, the distinction between the way in which the reference is made to mankind in verse 9 and in verse 14 is significant. In verse 9 πάντα ἄνθρωπον and τὸν κόσμον serve the purpose. This is a rather neutral and removed way of referring to people in general. But in verse 14, the first person is used to refer to the same group. This suddenly becomes more personal and inclusive. It has the illocutionary force of associating the different referents. The perlocutionary effect of the sudden usage would be that the readers would identify with mankind in general, and especially with the author, who also aligns himself/herself with mankind, but also, and more specifically with the readers. It is this clear that the author tries to establish some kind of 'bond' between himself/herself and the readers. If the first person ἐθεασάμεθα is taken to be inclusive, the same is true for this usage. However, if it is taken as an exclusive usage, then the author is using the utterance with the *illocutionary* force of *assuring* the readers of first-hand knowledge. The *perlocutionary* aim would clearly be to induce in the reader trust for the author and to establish his/her authoritative interpretation of events. It is clear from this short example that both *docilitas* and *benevolentio* are served here. One can thus conclude that part of the aim of the prologue is to establish the person of the author in the eyes of the reader so that the appropriateness conditions for the conversation between them and the text is clear to them all, right from the start. The author clearly indicates that, because of his/her historically superior and omniscient position about the events of the Jesus-story, he/she is also a trustworthy and reliable interpreter of the events. The perlocution of the whole of the prologue would seem to be that the reading of the Gospel is a worthwhile, important and significant undertaking in which the readers are expected to participate, because they are part of it.

The first part of the Gospel of John is therefore extremely important in establishing the speech situation and the relationship between the author and the readers. To conclude, one can perhaps summarize the expectations which govern the speech situation between implied author and readers:

- * The linguistic, communicative, and literalness presumptions must be considered.
- * The author intends to appear an authoritative interpreter of Jesus.
- * He/she identifies with the readers.

- * He/she is trustworthy.
- * The readers can expect him/her to obey the conventions of a normal literary speech situation.
- * The readers can expect the CP to be observed.
- * The author shares at least some knowledge about the Jewish religion with them. Also religious groupings are assumed to be well known. They share knowledge about certain topographical features in Palestine. The author expects the readers to have some knowledge about religious writings since a number of Old Testament images and intertextual themes are introduced into the text.

Up till chapter 4, the image of the implied author projected to the readers is basically that of a narrator, who because of his/her reliability and care for the readers, is the ideal person to lead the readers into the story of Jesus. He/she complies with all the requirements of the ideal story teller and in the conversation between author and readers does not seem to deviate much from the expected rules and appropriateness conditions usually observed in this kind of communication. We have already indicated what the concept implied reader refers to, but the definition of Iser (1978:34) also seems very useful, and is also given here. He argues that the implied reader comprises 'all those predispositions necessary for a literary work to exercise its effect — predisposition laid down, not by an empirical outside reality, but by the text itself.... Thus the concept of the implied reader designates a network of response inviting structures, which impel the reader to grasp the texts'.

It is thus important to utilize the text of the Gospel to determine the implied reader. But again it must be stressed that for the purpose of our examination of John 4 only the information relevant prior to that is important. The following should be mentioned (see also Culpepper 1987:211-227 and Staley 1986a:54-67):

- * It is assumed that the readers know the author.
- * They have prior knowledge of Jesus presented to them in chapters 1-3.
- * It seems that some of the readers know John the Baptist and that some do not. The disciples are a well-known group, although individuals are introduced.
- * Jewish groups and sects are also recognized and no explanations are necessary.
- * The readers are expected to be well versed in the geography of Palestine, but on a very general level — more specific locations are described in much more detail.
- * The readers probably knew only Greek. Greek forms are used consistently and terms like Rabbi and Messiah are explained early in the narrative.

- * It seems that the readers have extensive knowledge of the Old Testament and Jewish religious tradition.
- * The readers, although they have a general knowledge of Judaism, still require explanations as to the specific details such as ritual, purity and the like.
- * The readers are familiar with the story of Jesus before it is told. They are familiar with John the Baptist and other aspects of the stories told about Jesus.
- * The readers are expected to be able to interpret the language of the Gospel correctly — that is, they should be able to interpret the story, symbols, irony, and double meanings correctly.

Keeping the above in mind, it is necessary to note that all these factors are determinants for the establishing of the general rules that apply to the speech situation presupposed in the Gospel. The implied author has a specific audience in mind and there is thus a special relationship between them. They communicate in the Greek language and he/she can thus expect a certain competency from them in playing with the language. The CP is assumed to be observed by both parties and the author has enough reliance on the abilities of his/her readers to allow himself/herself quite a lot of leeway in using language, symbols, traditions and images. The author, although he/she expects a very mature reading of the text from his/her audience, nevertheless reckons with the inability of his/her readers to understand everything relating to the Jewish culture and so on, and provides them with the necessary clues and information. In this way the author is established as a reliable and trustworthy narrator. Although the readers are of Christian orientation, and familiar with various Old Testament traditions, they are not exempt from misconceptions regarding Christianity. Being aware of this fact, the author skillfully, by using their knowledge, leads them to accept new viewpoints regarding crucial matters, such as the relationship between Jesus and the Logos, the nature of true faith, the response to Jesus, and so on. The presupposed relationship between the implied author and readers is therefore crucial in the communication process, because it determines the nature of the communication and establishes the conditions in which this specific kind of communication can function successfully.

Finally, still on the level of the communication between implied author and reader, a few observations regarding the perceptions about Jesus and his person created by the implied author for the readers, are necessary.

The way in which they perceive the character of Jesus is also one of the determinants for their reception of the story and the conversation with the Samaritan woman in John 4:1-42. The readers are provided with a great deal of information in the prologue and the words of the Baptist which

together provide the following script for Jesus: he will come to his own, authorize those who believe to become 'children of God', give grace and truth, reveal God and take away the sin of the world. The reader can expect that he will be rejected by his own, witnessed by John, and believed by some. All of these expectations are later fulfilled, but the introduction to Jesus gives no real clues as to what he will do or how he will fulfill his commission.

(Culpepper 1987:108)

As the story develops, the readers begin to get glimpses of the character of Jesus: he gathers a group of disciples around him as witnesses to forthcoming deeds, through his actions and the words of others, the information supplied in the prologue is confirmed — the disciples call him Messiah, and believe in him, he shows his supernatural powers at the feast in Cana, and fulfills scriptures regarding his zeal for the temple, clashes with the authorities, is misunderstood by them, and it is mentioned that a large number of people become believers in him. In chapter 3 the whole of the discussion with Nicodemus reveals more of Jesus' mission to the world. After this, there is again a reference to the words of John the Baptist in 3:22-36, and again the unique bond between Jesus and the Father, and his unique position is elucidated. Now the story can continue — the author has provided enough clues for his/her readers to expect from them that they will be able to interpret the subsequent story of the continuing mission of Jesus successfully. The above-mentioned information about Jesus also comprises much of what is usually called literary context and has close links with the structure of the literary work. It is, however, important for the implementation of speech act theory that the 'structure' or 'literary context' be modified somewhat to facilitate the implementation of percepts such as the relationship between readers and characters and the perception of the readers as the narrative presents it. This is important because the perceptions created by the text and text structure are important contributing factors in the whole process of how readers will interpret subsequent events and dialogue.

We have in this section given some preliminary observations as to participants, the relationships between them, conditions that can be assumed to be in force, speech acts involved and the levels of communication in the text. Keeping this in mind, we can now attempt a more detailed reading of the text of John 4:1-42, through which we hope to discover something of the communication and style of this pericope.

CHAPTER FOUR

A SPEECH ACT READING OF JOHN 4:1-42

1. *Units of analysis*

In order to obtain some insight into the structure of the text (which is also a stylistically determined feature), and to have manageable units which can adequately be analyzed, the text of John 4:1-42 will be divided into smaller units of analysis. The following observations are relevant here:

First, following the *dialogue structure* one can perhaps start by considering the different dialogues as units, that is, the start of the conversation between Jesus and the woman in 4:7b, as the beginning of a unit. The unit ends with the words of Jesus in 4:26, since the introduction of the character of the disciples heralds a new subsection. This means that 4:7b-26 can be considered a coherent whole.

Secondly, the narrative transition 4:27 where the change in dialogue partners is described, which also starts with a temporal indication Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ, clearly ends with 4:30, since 4:31 similarly begins with a temporal indication and contains the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples. We can thus conclude that 4:27-30 is also a separate unit which can be analyzed as a coherent section of narrative.

Thirdly, as we have already indicated, a new section starts with 4:31. This subsection ends when the narrator again takes up the story after the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples and where the direct speech by Jesus ends in 4:38. In 4:39 there is a reference to the townspeople discussed in 4:27-30, and the whole of this subsection deals with different subject material from 4:31-38. Therefore 4:31-38 can also be considered a unit.

Fourthly, it is clear that a whole new sequence is introduced in 4:43 because of the shift in both temporal and spatial setting. This serves to indicate that 4:39-42 is also a separate unit. The majority of commentaries and studies on this pericope agree that verse 42 is indeed the end of this specific narrative.

In the fifth place, we must return to the beginning of the pericope to the verses preceding the actual dialogue which begins in 4:7b. We can agree with Boers (1988:2) that 4:1-4 forms a transition from the preceding chapter and serves as a general introduction to this narrative.

Sixthly, 4:5-7a forms a more specific introduction to the story in identifying the specific setting and participants of the subsequent dialogue.

We can therefore conclude by stating that the following will be considered as coherent units which will be discussed as such in our detailed analysis of the pericope: 4:1-4, 4:5-7a, 4:7b-26, 4:27-30, 4:31-38 and 4:39-42. Before we start a

detailed reading it should be again stressed that, since the language medium of this book is English, we have used English quotations as far as possible. Where there are quotations from foreign languages, and the relevant works have been translated adequately, I have given the official translation, but also referred to the original language copies. Where no recognized translation exists, I have given the original, but translated more unfamiliar languages such as Dutch and Afrikaans myself.

2. The incident in Samaria analyzed

2.1 4:1-4 General introduction to the story

Text:

<4> 'Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης 2 - καίτοι γε Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ - 3 ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 4 ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.

Before we begin the analysis it should be noted that, as we indicated in Chapter III, whenever there is mention of author or readers the *implied* author and *implied* readers are meant. The reference is never to the real author or readers.

Our text opens in 4:1 with the mentioning of the large number of converts Jesus is making, which is mediated to the reader together with the mention of the party of the Pharisees. The mention of the large number of converts as well as the mention of the Pharisees is significant here.

The reference to the converts serves to relate this specific pericope to 3:22ff. The necessity and significance of this indication that the information in 3:22ff is important for interpreting events in this piece of narrative will only become apparent later. Thus, the content of this opening utterance is clearly not chosen at random. It is an indication that this episode can be related to the preceding section and forms part of a more comprehensive whole. The episode which follows should, therefore, not be interpreted in isolation but as part of the whole, and thus contributing to the understanding of the whole of the Gospel. The way in which the links between parts of the whole discourse are established is also indicative of the style of the Gospel. However, the total picture of how different parts relate and communicate will only be clear and attainable once the whole of the Gospel narrative is read and analyzed on a macro level. Here we can only show how this episode is linked to the preceding, and indicate items which may possibly be reintroduced later.

With reference to the Pharisees, it is the third time they have been mentioned in the Gospel (see also 1:24; 3:1), and each time they are involved with questions on authority. They are introduced in all these cases without further ado so that it would seem that the author expects his/her readers to know what

the significance is. This is confirmed by 4:3 where it is mentioned that Jesus went away when he heard that the Pharisees heard that he was making more disciples. Commentators have had difficulty in explaining 4:3, because no reason for Jesus' going to Galilee is actually mentioned. The difficulty in understanding this specific utterance arises because the author is obviously breaking the *clarity principle* (see Leech 1983:66) of textual rhetoric. The utterance is not as clear as one would expect. This lack of clarity makes it imperative for the readers to try to understand the utterance by means of *implicature*. Because the readers have no reason to believe otherwise, they must assume that the author is still observing the CP, and still wants to communicate. This assumption on the side of the readers necessitates the implementation of implicature. The *effect* of this (which is probably intended) is that it immediately compels the readers to participate in the events of the story, if they are to understand the story at all.

One can perhaps say that there is a 'gap' in the text here. In the words of Iser (1980:111), the function of the gap in literary communication may be described as

a process set in motion and regulated, not by a given code, but by a mutually restrictive and magnifying interaction between the explicit and the implicit, between revelation and concealment. What is concealed spurs the reader into action, but this action is also controlled by what is revealed; the explicit in its turn is transformed when the implicit has been brought to light. Whenever the reader bridges the gaps, communication begins. The gaps function as a kind of pivot on which the whole text-reader relationship revolves.

The reader is thus forced to calculate what meaning can be construed from the text. The non-observance of the clarity principle can be accounted for in two ways. *First*, it is possible that it is basically the normal way of telling a story, observing the principle of economy; that is, not giving too much information. In the scheme of Leech (1983:67), this is a principle which is in constant conflict with the principle of clarity. *Secondly*, it could also be an intended or deliberate deviation from the principle. This would imply that, because the author's seriousness about the communication with the readers has clearly been indicated in the previous three chapters, we can, therefore, assume that the CP is still being observed. This means that implicature is necessary to resolve the problems concerning the meaning. The obvious non-observance of the principle and the difficulties of interpretation which arise (see commentaries, Olsson 1974:126-127) would lead one to suspect that the text is offering some clue to the readers how to understand the text.

From Culpepper's analysis (1987:222), it seems that the implied readers have some knowledge about the story of Jesus and the different Jewish groupings, and they can, therefore, be expected to calculate the author's meaning correctly. However, in the conversational structure, this use of the language by the author would have some *perlocutionary effect* on the readers. Up till chapter 4, the

Pharisees were only mentioned *twice*, and no negative assertions about them were made. (Later in the Gospel they continue to be more and more equated with the very negative 'Ιουδαίου.) Here we perhaps find the beginnings of a theme of typing the group of the Pharisees in a negative light. The *illocutionary* force of these two utterances (4:1,3) is *to assert* that there is a friction between Jesus and the Pharisees. (See Bach & Harnish 1979:41-42 and Leech 1983:198-226 on assertions). The *perlocutionary* effect of this assertion can be a deepening feeling of suspense whenever the party of the Pharisees is mentioned. This is perhaps the start of a campaign on the author's side to gradually incite the readers against the Pharisees. Further analysis of the whole Gospel could perhaps validate this, but it is unfortunately beyond the scope of this study. (The fact that Jesus left Judea for Galilee because of some negative attitudes is also implied by the similar rather unclear sequence in 4:43ff.)

Another intended perlocution on the author's side could be to again get the readers to be involved in the narrative by compelling them to participate through implicature, by using the rather veiled assertions of possible danger to Jesus. This is a good strategy, narrative-wise, because it is obvious that a new narrative sequence is introduced in 4:1 and it is imperative to again ensure the *attentio* of the readers at the start of what will prove to be a very important pericope in the Gospel.

In 4:2, the first of a number of explicit commentaries in the pericope is found. Lombard (1987:399) explains that these explicit commentaries were 'originally made by the narrator every time he purposely interrupted the flow of the narrative to change to a different mode or tense. These comments are also known as "asides", "footnotes" and the "whispering wizard of the imperfect tense". There is some difficulty in determining the exact extent of these footnotes. Lombard (1987:400) identified 203 such footnotes in John, and classified them into 10 classes. His classification, however, includes most of the non-conversation parts of the text of John 4:1-42. If the nature of these asides as explicit commentaries can be characterized as 'an interruption of the normal flow of the narrative' then it would seem *improbable* that the whole of 4:1-6, 8, 9, 27, 39-41 consists of 'interruptions' of the normal flow of the narrative. Rather, these verses are an essential part of the narrative framework of the pericope.

It seems more prudent to take the conservative route and concentrate on utterances in which the author is clearly giving conscious directions to his/her readers regarding the understanding of the events described. A limited number of observations by the author can be seen to be intrusive — a possible criterion could be that the asides explain an utterance made immediately prior to the explanatory remark and are thus intrusive. In this particular pericope, verses 2, 8 and 9b correlate with this. Each time, a previous remark is explained or the logic behind the remark/utterance is elucidated.

In 4:2, the fact that Jesus did not baptize alone is stressed. This can account for the large number of baptized converts mentioned in verse 1. In 4:8, the fact that Jesus asks the woman rather than his disciples for water is explained, and in 4:9b the reaction of the Samaritan woman to Jesus' request is explained. The significance of these explanatory notes will be discussed in due course.

The first of these notes in 4:2 serves a specific purpose here. The note explains the remark in 4:1 about the baptism of large numbers of people by Jesus. The note actually explains that Jesus was not alone, and that his disciples accompanied him, and baptized the converts. The information given in this utterance, is strictly speaking, not really necessary. We make this statement for the following reason. From the outset of his ministry, Jesus was constantly accompanied by his disciples (see 1:43, 51; 2:1, 12, 17; 3:22) and in 3:22 the fact that his disciples also baptized is mentioned explicitly. The practice of mentioning only Jesus, the protagonist, and implying the inclusion of the group of disciples as minor characters is by no means so unclear as to validate the explanation. This seems to be the author's normal practice, since in 2:13 the fact that Jesus went to the feast is mentioned but not that the disciples accompanied him. It is, however, clearly implied, for later on in the narrative (2:17) they are mentioned as witnesses (see also Okure 1988:83).

The fact that the author found it necessary to explain the presence of the disciples here in 4:2 clearly has some specific purpose. Most of the commentaries, such as, for example those of Schnackenburg (1965:456; 1968:420), Brown (1982,1:164), Barrett (1978:230) and Morris (1981:252), explain the *hapax legomenon* καίτοι γε and the reference to the disciples' baptizing practices as a later addition to the text which tries to harmonize 3:22 and 4:2. No mention of their function in the text as a whole is made or considered, even though some of the commentators agree that the καίτοι γε is unusual. However, the rather exceptional beginning of the verse (the *hapax legomenon*), and its unnecessary explanatory nature, both signal to the readers that this specific verse is significant, a 'gap' in Iser's terms. The author had clearly, in terms of Leech's textual rhetoric (1983:15-17), contravened the *principle of economy*. It was not necessary to give so much detail. The readers, on the grounds of previous experience in reading the Gospel, are accustomed to assume that wherever Jesus goes his disciples are also present. The question that needs to be answered here is why this non-observance of the economy principle occurred. Olsson (1974:125-126) argues that this verse should be considered in terms of its function in the narrative:

Since 3:22 states, without comment, that Jesus did baptize, scholars have given much thought to the nature of this baptism.... As a rule v.2^B is explained as being a gloss. Yet is this not an attempt to explain away the verse, as no function can be found for v.2 in the given interpretation of the text as a whole? If a redactor did insert this item, why then did he not so do in 3:22?... The situation seems to me to be such that we should investigate whether or not v. 2 may have a function related to the text as a whole.

According to Olsson (1974:138) and Okure (1988:79-82), the function of this verse and others (4:1-4) is to relate the rest of the pericope to the context of 3:22ff and 4:43ff.

On the whole, one can agree with Olsson that the unit of 4:1-4 serves this purpose, as we argued regarding 4:1, but in terms of the obvious non-observance of the economy principle, 4:2 also seems to have significance for the *communication* between author and readers, that is, the readers are to calculate exactly what can be deduced from this utterance. By giving *abundant* information at the start of a new narrative, the author is certainly implicating something to the readers. In addition, the question as to the pragmatic force (Leech 1983:17) or possible intended perlocution of this specific utterance, whose specific illocutionary force was established by implicature, needs to be answered.

Staley (1986a:173-177) agrees that 4:2 is somewhat problematic and attempts to answer the question of its function in the following way: the implied author leads the readers to believe that Jesus did indeed baptize people himself (3:22) and then continues to contradict this in 4:2, thus

the implied reader finds that he had only been set up to be hoodwinked later by the juxtaposition of 3:22 and 4.2... The rhetorical purpose of the implied author's 'reader-victimization strategy' is therefore to reeducate [his] audience; to force the implied reader to realize that in spite of his high degree of knowledge, he still does not know everything. The Gospel, as well as being an aesthetic whole, is a 'learning program'.

(Staley 1986a:176-177)

We agree that Staley's proposition could be a valid one, but it does seem strange that the author should go to such lengths to victimize his/her readers on a topic of such limited importance as the baptismal practices of Jesus. Furthermore Staley (1986a:175) asserts that in 3:22 'the narrator tells the implied reader that Jesus was baptizing'.

However, a close reading of 3:22 does not necessitate the view that Jesus was baptizing people himself. A simple explanation could very well be that the author was not deliberately misleading the readers in 3:22, but was merely discussing the fact of baptism, in order to introduce the discussion of the Baptist, without deeming it necessary to give too many details on the administrators or practicalities of baptism (economy principle). Furthermore, Staley's view necessitates an interpretation to the effect that 3:22 is significant for the understanding of the rest of the narrative, but there are no clues in the text here to indicate this significance. Moreover, Staley (1986a:170) states that this device of victimizing the reader 'is not found in the first two major divisions of the text'.

The two major divisions he refers to are found in 1:1-3:36. If this is the case, then it seems strange that 3:22, which falls under the second of the two main

divisions, is such an integral part of this victimization program, which according to Staley is only found in the text from 4:1! One can conclude that Staley's interpretation of 4:1-3 is possible, but not probable, since it contains contradictions.

More probable is the view taken here that the author, in introducing a new episode of his/her story, is again taking pains to get the readers on his/her side, especially if we agree with Staley (1986a:102-129) that a major new 'ministry tour' starts in 4:1ff, and some new themes are to be introduced here.

By telling the reader that Jesus himself did not baptize, but that his disciples did, the author gives an indication of being a very cautious narrator, in actually stating the obvious — for the benefit of the readers. They should learn to acknowledge the fact that the author is meticulous in the presentation of material and can be trusted with regard to small matters. From this it follows that in general that the author is also a reliable and trustworthy narrator with regard to grave and important matters. This verse contrasts strongly with 4:1 and 4:3 where the author actually gives too little information and very subtly leads the readers to feel suspense by implicating that there may be a conflict with the Pharisees. This subtlety and the involvement of the readers (*attentio*) established in this way is enhanced by 4:2 where the author's obvious trustworthiness is stressed for the readers' sake, this time by giving a little too much information. The combination of the perlocutionary effects or pragmatic force of the opening verses of chapter 4, and the fact that it is on an informative level, setting the scene for the actual narrative starting in 4:5, is clearly to ensure the full participation of the readers and to establish their goodwill and the narrator's trustworthiness. Why the author is taking pains to assure them of his/her trustworthiness, probably has to do with the message presented in 4:1-42: the preaching and the acceptance of the message of Jesus in Samaria. If the story might sound doubtful, or unacceptable, or unlikely to readers, this could explain the extra care taken by the author to ensure that the readers would accept this account as true. Also if the Samaritans as a group are perceived by the readers of the Gospel to be undesirable or unacceptable believers this would allow for the speech acts employed.

The above explanation can also be supplemented by the observation that if we do find a 'gap' in 4:2, this very difficult verse can perhaps be better understood once part or even the whole of the narrative has been read. According to Kriek (1988:40), gaps which occur in a text where too little information is supplied, can be solved virtually immediately after the gap occurs, for instance, in cases of personal pronouns without previous references or events not referred to previously. Gaps can also be filled in totally or only provisionally after the narrative has progressed somewhat. Another category of gap is only solved at the end of the narrative, while yet another category is not even solved at the end of a story, and it is left to the readers to provide a solution.

It seems that the *second possibility* is valid here; that is, when a possible solution can be established only after the narrative has progressed for a while. We will return to this verse later in the analysis when we are dealing with 4:31-38, where it seems that a possible explanation for the apparent needless insertion of this information can be found.

Regarding the use of ἔδει in 4:4, Louw and Nida (1988,1:671-672) state that it is used here for the meaning of 'to be something which should be done as the result of compulsion, whether internal (as a matter of duty) or external (law custom, and circumstances) — "should, ought to have to do"'.

Thus, according to Louw and Nida (1988,1:672), the meaning of something that must be done with the implication of some sort of 'inevitability', is not relevant here. Whether the divine plan of God is involved is a matter that must be inferred from the context or by theological reasoning. The meaning for which the word is used here does not contain this inference as such. The case could, however, be argued both ways — that is, that it is Jesus' destiny to go through Samaria (see Brown 1982,1:169; Morris 1981:225; Okure 1988:85-6) or that it was practically a quicker route (Flavius Josephus Ant XX,118; Vit 269; Dalman 1924:229, 249-256; Lagrange 1936:103; Schnackenburg 1965:458; 1968:422; Bultmann 1957:128; 1971:176). The latter case seems to have a little more support, but the alternative is also acceptable.

We prefer the interpretation that the use of ἔδει at first only serves to help set the scene for the subsequent dialogue and that it is purely informative and is not a specific communication from the author to the reader in the form of an aside. Further support for this view stems from the fact that the verb is in the imperfect tense which is the usual tense of a narrative depicting the background in Greek (see Louw 1971:26). The full significance as to the theological implication of ἔδει can only become clear once the whole of the reading process of the Gospel has been completed and the significance of this pericope in the whole Gospel is established. The totality of the Gospel may very well indicate that ἔδει is referring to Jesus' destiny or divine calling. O'Day (1986:55-56) and Okure (1988:83-86) contend that this is indeed the case here. Boers (1988:153) makes an interesting point regarding the ambiguity of this usage at this stage in the story in stating that 'it is important for the flow of the narrative to note that it [*the meaning of ἔδει — JEB*] is not clear in verse 4'.

Regarding the whole of the utterance in 4:4, it can be noted that the mentioning of Samaria could possibly be a ploy to evoke unease with the readers. Samaria and the Samaritans are not very favorable concepts to mention because of the hostility between Jews and Samaritans about which the readers are informed. In the light of the hostile situation, it is not really advisable for a Jewish rabbi to journey through this territory. However, he had to (ἔδει). This ambiguous constative can have the perlocutionary effect of creating a feeling of suspense in the readers. This would further serve to ensure the readers' attention for what is to follow.

2.2 Brief summary of 4:1-4.

In this first section of the pericope the author uses the language in the following way: on the informative level he/she sets the scene for the subsequent dialogues, that is, the author gives the necessary background information to enable the readers to understand the rest of the narrative and establishes links with the previous and subsequent section. One can agree that this could have been done in a number of ways, depending on the choices which the language can offer. But the fact remains that it is done here in a specific manner which is significant for the total communication of the text — including the intended perlocutions. *First*, by structuring the informative utterances as is done in 4:1-4, the readers are immediately induced to being involved in the story, that is, by means of the non-observance of the clarity principle in 4:1 and 3, and which implicates that something was amiss between the Jews and the Pharisees without specifying exactly what. The element of suspense thus created serves to involve the readers affectively, again catching their attention and so getting them involved in the narrative. *Secondly*, by giving somewhat redundant information and breaking the economy principle in 4:2, the intended perlocution is to appear to the readers as a considerate and trustworthy writer, thus assuring or rather reassuring the readers in this way that what is to follow is to be judged in the same vein, although it might sound somewhat strange to them. *Thirdly*, the statement to the effect that Jesus had to go through Samaria also serves the purpose of gaining the attention of the readers by the possible negative connotations regarding Samaria and the Samaritans. Thus the scene is set for what is to follow, the readers are sufficiently 'softened up' and involved, and the author is firmly established as a reliable narrator and interpreter of subsequent events.

At the end of each summary we will also offer a schematization of the speech acts employed in the specific section. It must be kept in mind that speech acts can also be formed by a number of smaller speech acts, each contributing towards the total illocution and perlocution of the utterance and without contradicting the totality. This is why we have decided to concentrate on discussing somewhat more elaborate speech acts in our analysis, without denying that there are smaller speech acts that contribute to the whole. However, where necessary we have focused on smaller speech acts. The speech acts used in 4:1-4 can perhaps be depicted as follows:

v 1 and 3: Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης....ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: Creating suspense, involving the readers at the start of a new section, assuring attentiveness by not giving full details.

v 2: - καίτοι γε Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ -

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: Reassuring readers that he/she is a cautious narrator. Directing the reader's attention to a 'gap' in the text that will need subsequent attention.

v 4: ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: Creating suspense by not giving full reasons, involving readers in the narrative. The exact import of the ἔδει is also left open for future interpretation.

2.3 4:5-7a: *Specific introduction to the story*

Text:

5 ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχάρ πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ [τῷ] Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· 6 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ· ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη. 7 Ἐρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ.

We have chosen this specific unit (4:5-7a) for analysis not because it can be separated from either the previous section or the subsequent discourse, but on the grounds that it describes in more detail the setting of the conversation at the well. The unit of 4:1-4 functions in a more general way to link the story with the previous narratives and the subsequent continuation of the journey referred to in 4:3, and to establish the necessary rapport between author and readers. The unit 4:5-7a is a specific introduction to the discourse and subsequent events at the well, and this functions on a different level from the unit 4:1-4.

Right at the beginning of the narrative section 4:5-7a, it is repeated that the party of Jesus came near the Samaritan town. *Samaritan* is repeated twice in two subsequent utterances, which seems unnecessary because the readers would have easily identified the town or city as Samaritan. Obviously the fact is stressed to indicate some importance here, especially if one takes into consideration the fact that the town Sychar is a rather well-known site of the Samaritan religion, as Olsson (1974:142) indicates: 'After Shechem's destruction by the Jews in 128 and 107 B.C. and before the erection of Neopolis

was begun in 72 A.D., Askar [*Sychar* — *JEB*] appears to have been a rather large town, which seems to have taken Shechem's place, namely to have been *the Samaritan religious and national center.*'

The author is stressing the fact that the whole scene is situated in Samaria and strangely continues to repeat this fact in 4:7-9, even though it is quite clear that the Samaritans are involved. The following information is furnished to the reader regarding the scene at the well:

- * Jesus and the disciples came to a town/city in Samaria.
- * The place was called Sychar.
- * It was close to a field.
- * The field was given by Jacob to Joseph.
- * This Joseph was Jacob's son.
- * There was a well.
- * The well was named after Jacob.
- * Jesus was tired from the journey.
- * He sat down at the well alone (the disciples went to town).
- * It was midday/noon (see Boers 1988:159; Louw 1989:13-18).
- * A woman, a Samaritan, came to fetch water at the well.
- * They started talking.

At first this short piece of narrative seems to be merely *informative*, setting the scene in neutral terms so that the readers are able to grasp the dialogue better. However, the references implied in the mentioning of certain items and expressions are significant for the decoding of this specific text. By choosing these specific pieces of information, the author intends to do something with it. The repeated use of the term *Samaritan* can indicate that the issue of Jew versus Samaritan is involved. For readers supposedly well versed in the Old Testament, the whole dispute between Jew and Samaritan would be a known factor (see Old Testament passages such as 2 Ki 17:24-41; Ezr 4:4; 1 Ezr 5:72). The socio-historical context which functions as a background for the narrative is designated by the repetition of the term *Samaritan*. There was great tension between Jews and Samaritans and in general they avoided each other. There are a vast number of publications on the relationship between Jews and Samaritans, such as Daube (1950), Kippenberg (1971), Pazdan (1987), Vorster (1988b:19-23), Macdonald (1964), and especially Okure (1988:316-318). Despite the fact that in 4:9 this lack of intercourse between Jews and Samaritans is spelled out explicitly, it seems that the readers of the Gospel can be expected at least to know that the relationship between Jews and Samaritans was problematic, without necessarily being aware of all the detail of the strict rules regarding the Samaritans. But the fact remains that by mentioning the Samaritans, the whole problem of the strained relations between Judaism and Samaritan belief is presented to the readers right from the start of this pericope,

as we indicated regarding 4:4. Following the stressing of the Jewish-Samaritan controversy, one can assume that the fact that Jesus, who up to now in the Gospel has been presented as a typical Rabbi who strictly adhered to the conventions of the time, is depicted as arriving at a Samaritan village/city — perhaps even the center of Samaritan worship (see Olsson 1974:140), can be somewhat problematic. Immediately the air of expectancy already presented in 4:4, is dramatically increased here as this type of conduct is not usual for the character of Jesus as described so far in the Gospel.

The mentioning of the names of Jacob, Joseph and the history of the well is also significant for the readers of the Gospel. Jacob and Joseph are well-known characters to the readers as one can see from the fact that they are introduced without any further qualification. The readers know who they are from the Old Testament traditions. The fact, however, that the author not only describes Jesus' arrival at *a* well in Samaria, but at this *specific* well, would indicate to the readers that something is to be deduced from this abundance of information. Again it would seem that the economy principle or even the relevance principle was not adhered to. It is the first time that the exact location of any action in the Gospel narrative is described in such detail. This almost inappropriately lengthy description of the exact location of the conversation invites the readers to deduce some meaning from the length of the utterance (4:5-6a).

The reference to Jacob and Joseph would immediately produce images of faith, orthodox Jewish tradition and the history of salvation. At this stage of the narrative, the full implications of the mentioning of these names with regard to Samaritan worship, could have become apparent to the readers. It does, however, seem more likely that the readers are only made aware of the fact that the well has *some* significance for the story, and further details have to be awaited. The fact that the narrator gives this abundant amount of information, obviously wanting the readers' identification, has the effect that the readers will read the words from a viewpoint in which they will identify with the information given.

Jacob and Joseph are well-known figures from the tradition which they share with Judaism, whether they are Christians of Jewish or Gentile origin, and one would thus expect that the mentioning of these names would fall favorably on their ears. The fact that the Samaritans claimed Jacob and Joseph as their father (Bowman 1950:244) and that they in their tradition are the true *people* of Israel only becomes a stated fact in 4:12. Traditionally interpreters such as Schnackenburg (1965:457-459; 1968:421-424), Olsson (1974:139-144), MacDonald (1964:448), Okure (1988:88-90), and others immediately link the first mentioning of Jacob and Joseph to the whole question of the religious division between the parties. Although it can be granted that it is possible that the description of the well could have all these implications for the readers, this is unlikely. Because the reading process is linear, it follows that events/words/phrases of significance only become apparent with repeated use, and the parts become explicable only when viewed in the context of the whole.

In this instance, it would seem that the implied author is touching upon the descent of the *Samaritans* from Jacob in only a veiled sense. Since it also seems likely that the implied readers are not privy to specialized knowledge about the Samaritan religion, it is doubtful that their descent from the patriarchs is the reference here. The aim is to introduce exactly this theme later in the text, but by quoting the common ancestors of the faith in God here, the author is creating a false sense of security for the readers. They were supposed to feel the suspense when the traditional rabbi Jesus enters the hostile country of Samaria, but are now lured into believing that this is not too strange a description of his behavior because he decides to rest at the well of his and their real and/or spiritual forebears. An appropriate place indeed for a rabbi to rest in a 'foreign' hostile country. The readers are manipulated by this apparently redundant description of the resting place to expect the usual from Jesus. However, exactly this fact which serves to assure them, later proves to result in an especially difficult situation. In the terminology of Staley, this could well be *readers' victimization!*

Also of interest is the usage of *πηγή* and *φρέαρ*. These two words are used for virtually the same meaning, that is, *well*. Louw and Nida (1988,1:90) comment as follows:

7.57 *πηγή*^b, ἥς f; *φρέαρ*^a, αὐτοῦ n: deep constructions, often walled with stone, at the bottom of which was a pool of water — 'well'...

If there was a relatively ready flow of water, a well could very appropriately be called a *πηγή* 'spring,' (and this may be the reason for *πηγή* in Jn 4.6), but if water only gradually seeped into the well from surrounding areas or was collected in the well from surface drainage, it would be more appropriately called *φρέαρ*. However, both terms are used interchangeably in certain contexts; compare, for example, *πηγή* in Jn 4.6 and *φρέαρ* in Jn 4.11, both referring to Jacob's well at Sychar.

One could of course argue that *πηγή* perhaps has the connotation of running water, and that the author uses *πηγή* in connection with the name of Jacob (4:6) to indicate or correlate the true religion of the Jews as running or living water, whereas *φρέαρ* is used in (4:11) by the Samaritan woman. Whether this is a significant distinction here, is hard to decide. The decision can only be based on the interpretation of the context here, and not on the meanings of the Greek words. It is also possible that the variation could, of course, be a purely 'stylistic' variation to avoid monotony, with no allusions to anything else.

In 4:14, the word *πηγή* is again used by the character of Jesus but here for the meaning of 'spring', that is, a natural flowing source of water. There are, however, no other overt or covert clues provided here that could indicate that a certain reading or implication is called for, except the reference in 4:10ff to ὕδωρ ζῶν. This decision, however, is in the hands of each individual interpreter (see Olsson 1974:163 and Staley 1986a:180).

Carmichael (1980) and especially Eslinger (1987) find in the use of the terms referring to *water* and the *πηγή* and *φρέαρ*, euphemistic references to sexual

relations. They contend that these terms, together with the depiction of Jesus as a bridegroom in the previous chapter and the fact that an Old Testament betrothal type-scene (incident where the meeting of a well-known figure with a woman at a well results in a betrothal) is enacted here, indicate that the woman misunderstands Jesus' approach as a sexual approach and continues the discussion in this vein. Derrett (1988:291-298) is more cautious and merely states that the whole setting and the terminology recall the subject of fertility (water, crops, progeny, harvest and so on). These interpretations are possible, but only the total impact of the discourse can validate this. We shall deal with these concepts as the narrative develops.

Okure (1988:90-91) is strongly opposed to these views. She interprets the episode at the well as a missionary dialogue and, therefore, finds concepts like the *gift* of the well, Jacob as the *giver* of the well, and the fact that she equates the *κεκοπιακὼς* in 4:6 to being tired because of *missionary activity*, as referring to this. She also does not find the betrothal type scene as a parallel for the scene at the well but rather sees Joshua 24 as the Old Testament story underlying the episode.

Our interpretation of the significance of the total scene as it is described here, follows the contention that an Old Testament betrothal type-scene is the intertext referred to here. Keeping this in mind, it is now necessary that the plain story level must first be distinguished from the level of implied author and implied readers, because it seems that the intertext is relevant only on the level of the implied reader.

On the level of the characters, the following information is supplied: the Jewish rabbi Jesus journeys through Samaria, a place which is traditionally hostile to Jews, because of a long history of religious and social differences. At the town of Sychar he decides to rest and sit down, appropriately enough at the site where his religious ancestors also dwelled, that is, the well near the town. Because of the time of day, the sixth hour (12 noon), it seems only natural that he should be tired and thus requires some rest. We have chosen the interpretation of the 'sixth hour' as referring to about noon together with inter alia Boers (1988:159) and Louw (1989:13-18). Other interpreters who follow Walker (1960), prefer the interpretation that in the Gospel of John the hours are counted from midnight, which will make the sixth hour six in the morning. This is a good time for fetching water, but improbable in this specific context, where quite a long journey is presupposed by Jesus' tiredness. Furthermore, Louw (1989:13-18) has shown conclusively that data gathered from ancient texts point to a unified practice of counting hours from sunrise to sunset. This is also the case in John, as other time indications in the Gospel clearly indicate (see Jn 1:39, 4:52, 19:14).

More problematic is the arrival of a woman at the well. The fact that it is stressed that she is a Samaritan also intensifies the problematic nature of her arrival: they are two *strangers*, of *opposite belief*, *man* and *woman*, *Jewish rabbi*

and *Samaritan* woman, social anathemas to each other, and yet here they are confronted with each other. The felicity conditions for the conversation are so problematized by the social context that the conversation is actually an impossibility. However, the author, as is his/her right, allows the characters to engage in a conversation and it can safely be assumed that the presupposition in the text is that a 'normal' conversation between the characters is described. This means that one can expect the characters to adhere to the rules and social traditions of conversation, although the situation is somewhat strange. The CP and the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner are relevant, as well as the politeness principle, and the irony principle (see Leech 1983:16), each one with a number of maxims (see Leech 1983:132-151). Regarding the politeness principle, the following warning by Du Plessis (1985:31) with reference to the synoptic Gospels is also relevant for our analysis of John: *'In our present study where we deal with texts which are the product of a culture very far removed in time and customs of our own, the principle should be implemented with extreme caution.* There are unfortunately no studies which explores this aspect of the gospel's context' [Du Plessis' italics].

One can conclude that the conversational rules (implicated in the description of the scene in 4:5-7a) which are relevant for the dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman are those which the social and cultural context dictates, the context of the previous manner of discourse of the characters (in this case only Jesus has a previous discourse history), and the general rules of conversation which comes into play.

On the level of the *implied author/readers* there are a few additional factors to consider. The author is setting the scene for the subsequent discourse and establishing the felicity conditions by which the readers can judge the validity or invalidity of the subsequent dialogue, while signalling something additional to the implied readers by the vocabulary and the way in which the scene is described. We have already noted that the readers, who are quite knowledgeable about the patriarchs Jacob and Joseph, are softened up by the author into a false sense of security about the protagonist Jesus. In addition, the fact that a Jew/man arrives at a well after a journey, sits down at this well and converses with some female at this place is reminiscent of a few scenes in the Old Testament, where virtually the same type of incident is described — that is, betrothal scenes (Gn 24:10-61; Gn 29:1-20, Ex 2:15-21).

From the text, it seems probable that the author could expect the readers to make the necessary connections with the Old Testament traditions. Staley (1986a:177-178) comments as follows:

However, if the implied reader's knowledge of the story was shown to be deficient in certain respects, the implied author, with the 'woman at the well' story, turns right around and tips his hat to the implied reader and his knowledge of Hebrew scripture. The implied author turns the story into a brilliant parody of the patriarchal betrothal scenes,

and in so doing fosters an extremely intimate relationship with the implied reader which subtly instructs him in how to read intertextually (cf. 3:22!).

The fact that the scene at the well is reminiscent of Old Testament betrothal scenes has also been noted by Bligh (1962), Bonneau (1973:1252-9), Olsson (1974:162-73), Neyrey (1979), Carmichael (1980:335-337), Cahill (1982:41-48), Duke (1984), Staley (1986a:177-185), Eslinger (1987) and Boers (1988:159-160). All of the above agree that the implied author is signalling to the implied readers that the Old Testament scenes are relevant and evoked by his/her description of the scene at the well. According to Alter (1981:51), there are a number of type-scenes in the Old Testament that have fixed components and occur repeatedly. These include an encounter of future betrothed at a well --the betrothal scene. Staley (1986a:180-181) shows how Alter (1981:51-62) analyses the scene and then correlates it with the narrative in John 4:4-42. For clarity's sake we give a full account of this:

1. The future bridegroom or his surrogate travels to a foreign land
A) Jesus goes on a journey, and passes through a foreign area (4:3-5)
2. He encounters a girl or girls at a well.
B) Jesus encounters a woman at a well (vv. 6-7a)
3. Someone, either the man or girl draws water from the well
C) A discussion about drawing water (vv. 7b-15)
4. The girl or girls rush to bring home the news of the stranger's arrival
D) The woman leaves her water jar behind and returns to the city with news of Jesus' arrival (vv. 28-30)
5. A betrothal is concluded between the stranger and the girl, generally only after he has been invited to a meal
E) A discussion about a meal (vv. 31-34) and Jesus is asked to stay with the people of the city (vv. 40-42)

From the above, and especially from the correspondences, it does indeed seem that all the basic components of the betrothal type-scene are present in the text of 4:1-42. We will return to the perlocution of the total scene and dialogue later.

At this stage, it is important to note that the author suggests to his/her reader that this type of scene forms the background to this narrative. Previous authors have felt intuitively that the author is utilizing an intertext, but have never explained *why* it is perceived in this way. The fact that the *names* Jacob and Joseph as persons who were involved in such encounters, are mentioned of course pointed in the direction but again, why do they? What in the style or use of the language results in these conclusions? Speech act theory and its emphasis on rules and rule-breaking can, perhaps, give a better explanation as to *why* these scenes are evoked and why readers of the text arrive at these conclusions.

We have already noted that, if one views the descriptions of places and locations in the previous three chapters, it is significant that very few details are given — which is quite normal for a narrative. However, in 4:5-7, we suddenly find that the author goes to great lengths to describe the setting — actually giving too much information and thus breaking the principle of economy in communication. In the words of Pratt (1977:210-211) such a deviation ‘counts as a message that, as Riffaterre (1971) puts it, “there is some thing to discover”... In the literary speech situation, in other words, rulebreaking can be the point of the utterance; the same is true of many speech situations outside literature’.

The readers of John 4, therefore, have to calculate why such abundant information is given, and they have to deduce what can be implicated by this specific choice of words. Modern-day readers seem to agree that the author is evoking traditional betrothal type-scenes which are well within the ability of the implied readers to arrive at by means of implicature. The knowledge that this specific intertext is relevant here, serves to shape the expectation of the readers, and of the rules they will expect to be relevant for the exchange. The author is clearly trying to shape the expectations of the readers in a certain way, indicating to them that they can expect the characters to act in a certain way, to converse according to certain rules, and to adhere to the general principles of interpersonal rhetoric. Together with the knowledge they have thus far acquired of the protagonist, this provides the total setting by which they can evaluate and judge the subsequent exchange between Jesus and the woman.

2.4 Brief summary of 4:5-7a

In this section the scene for the confrontation between the character Jesus and the Samaritan woman is set. The fact that this more specific setting of the scene is necessary, will become apparent as the communication between the implied author and the implied readers progresses. Again the question must be asked why the utterances are structured as they are here. We have noted the unnecessary repetition of the word *Samaritan*, which focused attention on the fact that the problematic social and religious relations were relevant in this situation.

Furthermore, we have noted that the deliberate deviations from the normal and expected rules of conversation indicate to the readers that something more than just information is to be gleaned from all this. Such a deviation from the normal principles of textual rhetoric is found in 4:5-6 when the rather elaborate description of the setting is offered. This breaking of the economy principle indicates to readers that the information offered has more than the usual relevance. We argued that the special attention paid to identifying the well in terms of the common ancestors of the Jews and Samaritans, serves to reassure the readers about the conduct of Jesus. Although it seemed strange for him to venture into hostile and possibly unclean territory, his actions by visiting the

well of the patriarchs seem in order, especially since it is specifically mentioned that it was late in the afternoon, and that he was tired.

The speech acts employed so far, have served the purpose both of giving information and of reassuring the readers that, despite the strange and somewhat problematic setting, all is in order. However, the description of the setting already begins to implicitly signal to the readers that some kind of *intertext* can be relevant (see Harty 1985, Broich & Pfister 1985, Miller 1985 and Vorster 1988a). That this expectation is indeed realized, is indicated by the utterance describing the arrival of the woman. If the woman's arrival had not been added, it is doubtful whether any connection between this episode and the Old Testament scenes would be possible. But it is stated that the woman indeed came to fetch water, which immediately invokes the intertext of the betrothal scene.

This further problematizes the whole situation from the viewpoint of the readers. Having just been assured that all is well in the description so far, they are now confronted with a situation in which the outcome is the liaison between the male and female involved, which is unthinkable in this situation. The intertext is used here to create intolerable expectations, which can have the effect that suspense is again created and the readers are still forced to participate in the story. The use of the intertext is clearly a device which can be termed stylistic.

It is also possible to detect something of the way in which the implied readers are treated by the implied author. The type of information offered to them has served to create tension and suspense, but immediately after this assurances are offered, only to be dashed again by subsequent utterances.

Whether this is a pattern which will repeat itself, and which will be of significance stylistically speaking, is something which will only become clearer as the story progresses.

The speech acts employed in 4:5-7a can be summarized as follows:

ν 5-6α: ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχάρ πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ [τῷ] Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· ὁ ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: The mentioning of Samaria and Sychar is supposed to intensify in the readers a feeling of unease and this ensures *attentio*. By referring to Jacob and Joseph the readers are again reassured that all is in order. This enhances the involvement of the readers.

ν 6b: ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ· ὥρα ἦν ὥς ἕκτη.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: By stating that Jesus was tired, that it was noon and time to rest, the readers are still being reassured that the somewhat unorthodox conduct of Jesus has a logical explanation.

ν 7a: Ἐρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: The statement that a woman approaches the well to fetch water unstables the reader and creates immense suspense for immediately the betrothal type-scene is involved. This has the effect of even deeper reader involvement.

2.5 4:7b-26: Dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman

Of note here is *first* the quotation formulae utilized by the author. Olsson (1974:173-175) has shown that in this section we find that λέγει + object (+ subject) is used predominantly. (Once in 4:9 with the conjunctive particle οὖν.) This formula occurs ten times, while a slightly longer formula ἀπεκρίθη ... καὶ εἶπεν is used three times; twice to introduce a speech of Jesus and once to introduce an answer by the woman. Whether these introductory formulae are significant or merely variation to avoid repetition is difficult to say. Olsson (1974:174) states that 'a review of the passages in Jn where ἀπεκρίθη ... καὶ εἶπεν occurs gives no unequivocal answer'.

However, Olsson tends to implicate that this longer formula introduces (in this specific text) statements of certain importance. Others like Dalman (1898:19); Topel (1971:214-215), and Kilpatrick (1960:176-177) regard this alteration between the two formulae as a usage derived for the Septuagint which uses the two types of formulae interchangeably, without special significance. Previous usages in the gospel tend to confirm this view. Abbott (1906:454), on the other hand, gives more weight to the longer usage in that it is used to introduce doctrinal matters or explanations of misunderstandings. Important to answer, however, is the question of whether the more weighty or elementary doctrine or misunderstanding would escape the readers' notice if not introduced in this specific way. The answer is undoubtedly 'no'. The reason for this is the fact that the significance of an utterance is not to be determined primarily from the *quotation formula* but rather from its own *content*. We can thus conclude that the author is not implicating anything special here by the way

in which he/she introduces the different speeches — the variation can perhaps be attributed to knowledge of and influences by terminology frequently found in the Septuagint to introduce speeches. Eslinger (1987:171) also does not ascribe any special significance to the introductory formulae used here.

Secondly, a factor which must be kept in mind, is that especially in texts where characters converse with each other, it is important to distinguish the levels of communication. The author, by making the characters engage in a conversation in a specific way, is communicating certain ideas to his/her readers. It is thus imperative that the 'surface' communication on the level of the characters is analyzed, and that the communication on the level of the implied author/readers is subsequently established, because even if the communication fails on the level of the characters and they do not understand each other, it does not mean that the communication between implied author and readers has also failed. The very failure on the level of the characters can be indicative of something of extreme importance to the readers. It is thus clear that although the two levels should by no means be separated they must be clearly distinguished.

The whole of the dialogue between Jesus and the woman can be divided into two clearly distinguished sections because of the break in the text at 4:16, that is, 4:7b-15 and 4:16-26. (O'Day 1986:57-66, Eslinger 1987:171, Lindars 1972:177-191, Okure 1988:92, Boers 1988:154-169 and most of the commentaries also divide the text here.) Each of these sections can then also be divided into a number of subsections on the grounds of the flow of conversation between the participants, the progressions in the discussion, and the topics under discussion.

2.5.1 4:7b-15: The first half of the dialogue

(a) 4:7b-9 Opening the dialogue

Text

7b λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δός μοι πεῖν· 8 οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσιν. 9 λέγει οὖν αὐτῇ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρίτις, Πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὦν παρ' ἐμοῦ πεῖν αἰτεῖς γυναῖκος Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης; (οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.)

On the level of the characters, Jesus is sitting at a well where a woman, a Samaritan woman at that, arrives to draw water. Jesus addresses her with the words Δός μοι πεῖν (4:7b). The problem we experience here is that, because of the big difference in culture and our own inability to reconstruct social customs of the time adequately, it is difficult to decide if Jesus is complying with the politeness principle (see Leech 1983:131-142). This utterance is clearly in the form of an *imperative*, but the illocutionary force of the utterance does not

necessarily have to be ordering or commanding. Furthermore, we do not know what the usual form of addressing a strange/foreign woman in that socio-cultural system would be. (Interestingly enough, virtually no commentator comments on the *form* of Jesus' utterance and whether or not he is being polite or rude, despite the fact that this can be of extreme importance in understanding their communication.) Wendland (1985:176) in his analysis of the text typifies Jesus' utterance as a request, but also does not comment on the politeness or impoliteness of it, although he professes to work socio-linguistically, which should result in his giving attention to this aspect.

The above problem arises because there is no greeting prior to Jesus' utterance. This is probably because of the problematic nature of social interaction between Jews and Samaritans. McLaughlin (1984:173) calls this type of conversation opener, *topic initiating* openings, and states that these types of conversational openings 'are designed to short-circuit the social access process and provide immediately for recipient attention to matters of substance that the speaker intends to introduce'. Since it is in this specific context virtually impossible to interact in a normal way with the woman, or to make small talk prior to the introduction of the topic, it is necessary for the character Jesus to get down to business immediately.

However, the fact remains that Jesus' conversation opener is in the form of an imperative which, according to the general felicity conditions ruling *commands*, is impossible. It is impossible because Jesus is not in a position to issue such a command, nor is his relationship to this stranger of such a nature that a command can possibly have the chance of succeeding. An answer to this question of the nature of Jesus' utterance could perhaps lie in the woman's utterance when she reacts to this. She says *inter alia* *παρ' ἐμοῦ πίνει αἰτεῖς*, where the *αἰτεῖς* is descriptive of the illocutionary force of the utterance made by Jesus, and the way his utterance is being perceived. It appears that Jesus is thus *requesting* a drink of water, rather than *ordering* or *demanding* one.

From this, and because of a lack of further evidence it seems that the character Jesus approaches the woman, and opens the conversation in a polite manner. This immediately establishes some of the parameters in which the dialogue takes place and determines to some extent the appropriateness conditions which regulate this specific verbal exchange. Okure (1988:93-94) feels that Jesus' utterance is a request.

Before the character of the woman answers the author interrupts the discourse with another aside in 4:8, stating that the disciples have gone to buy food. This aside or commentary immediately becomes conspicuous because the maxim of relation (and possibly the one of quantity/economy) has been broken. In 4:7 the words of a character asking another character for a drink of water are introduced. Suddenly a totally different subject, chronology and characters are mentioned, contrary to what one would expect, especially since the event referred to could easily have been introduced *before* the dialogue started.

Because the readers would assume that the cooperation principle is still being observed by the author, they are again called on to resolve the dilemma created by the breach of the rules of textual rhetoric by *implicature*. *On the level of the characters*, this aside serves merely to remove the lesser characters from the scene and to explain why Jesus is alone and in need of assistance to get water. However, the *function* of this aside on the level of the communication *between the implied author and readers* is of greater significance. Just as the reader sits back to enjoy the conversation between the main figure Jesus and this strange woman, the flow of the dialogue is interrupted by the author. He/she explains the absence of the disciples. The question arises as to the illocution and perlocution of this utterance. There is a number of possible interpretations:

First, if the author's explanation consists of seemingly unnecessary and irrelevant information, it could serve to slow down the tempo of the narrative, much in the way a storyteller pauses to light a pipe — giving the audience time to digest what has just been said and heightening the anticipation of what is to follow. This could indeed be a possibility here — because of the problematic nature of the action just described: the fact that Jesus starts speaking with a Samaritan woman of all people! This should not escape the attention of the readers and the author allows the fact to sink in by a delaying tactic.

Secondly, the author could be removing the disciples from the scene, those who, as followers of the rabbi Jesus, provide for his every need, that is, performing the usual functions of the followers of a rabbi. By removing them and by letting Jesus ask the woman to do something his disciples usually do, the author could be implicating that Jesus' request for a drink is actually an appointment of the woman to the position of disciple of Jesus — something which the woman later in the narrative indeed becomes. By removing the disciples from the scene, the problematic nature of Jesus' approaching the woman is further intensified, since it was not customary to talk with females even in the presence of others; and here they are alone (see Pirque Aboth 1:5, Babilonian Talmud 536, Barrett 1978:240, Morris 1981:274, Brown 1982,1:173 and Okure 1988:133-134).

Thirdly, as we have indicated, the request of the lone figure by the well also recalls the Old Testament betrothal scenes vividly — with the difference that while the usual scene takes place in a *foreign* territory amid *friendly* people, this scene takes place in the midst of the territory of Israel among hostile people. While it is expected of the protagonist in the Old Testament type-scene to ask for water, here it is exactly the opposite. What the readers have come to know about Jesus is that he basically complies with the usual norms of conduct. Even when he cleansed the temple in 2:13-21, he did not do something socially or religiously unacceptable — he just showed his zeal for the established religion. Here we find him doing the unthinkable: speaking to a Samaritan woman, and yet, this speaking is reminiscent of a betrothal. Again we perceive the method

of using the inter-text to create expectations with the readers, only to dash these expectations immediately afterwards.

The difference, however, and the deviation from the usual, immediately signals to the perceptive reader that something else and not the usual betrothal type-scene is relevant here. The relationship started by the words of Jesus in 4:7 is clearly not leading to the usual outcome of encounters by a well — that is, a physical relationship, marriage or offspring. Staley (1986b:184) calls this a *parody* of the betrothal-type scene, and continues by explaining what he means by parodical:

Wayne Booth writes, 'though parody is not ordinarily thought of as "irony", it is ironic in our definition: the surface meaning must be rejected, and another, incongruous, and "higher" meaning must be found by reconstruction'.... In this Johannine example of parody, the earthly (and earthy!), physical sense of betrothal is to be rejected in favor of a heavenly, spiritual betrothal.

The choice here is difficult to make: does the author delay the tempo by explaining the absence of the disciples to give the readers time to digest the problematical situation? or is he/she signalling that even a Samaritan woman can be a disciple? or is he/she beginning to parody the betrothal type-scene? Are all three perhaps possible? To my mind it is doubtful that all three together are possible, although the first and the third possibilities are not mutually exclusive. But again it must be stressed that the fact remains that a gap is created in the text by the deliberate breaking of the maxim of relevance, and that this creates the necessity for the reader to resolve the problem in some way. How it is done, will of course depend on the shared knowledge between the reader and the author in the text, knowledge of the context, and so on. It is thus only natural that different readers will have different solutions — we have merely stated the possible intended perlocutions of the implied author. The way in which the implied author creates the opportunity for the implied readers to assign meaning to the text is also part of the style.

To continue the discussion of *the level of the characters* (which the author has just interrupted), it is significant to note that the request of Jesus is rejected by the woman. Her rejection is based on the observance of the appropriateness conditions which are valid in this specific context. In fact, she refers to this in her answer (Ἰουδαῖοι and Σαμαρίταις). The fact that she is Samaritan is repeated twice in 4:9 — once by the author and once by the woman herself. She is actually not being impolite but is introducing material to rectify the impossible situation that has arisen by Jesus' request. By reminding him of the traditions and customs, she is defending the *status quo*, and in fact protecting Jesus! Obviously some of the principles of interpersonal rhetoric are relevant here. By acknowledging his request and fulfilling his need, she will be committing something socially and culturally unacceptable, and allowing a Jewish man to become unclean (tact maxim: minimize cost to other, Leech

1983:132). However, if she does not comply with request, she is also in danger of being severely impolite and ignoring the need of another. She clearly has a dilemma — by doing what he asks, or by not doing what he asks, she is still in danger of contravening the politeness principle and the general rules of interpersonal relationships.

She reacts (or the author lets her react) by utilizing the syntactical sentence form of a *question*, but without asking a real question. Here we have to do with an indirect speech act (in Gricean terms), an act in the form of a question, with an illocutionary force other than that of a question. Retief (1984:139-141) has identified quite a number of speech acts in the form of a question, but with an illocutionary force other than that of requesting information. According to Ponelis (1979:294-295) the *form* of a question is used when the contents of a constative needs modification in order not to sound too harsh. In this context, it seems that this type of indirect speech act is employed here. Jesus asks an impossible thing from the woman — whether she responds positively or negatively she still has the dilemma that she will transgress some social or conversational rule. In order not to jeopardize the CP, and thus breaking the conversation pattern completely, she responds by using an interrogative sentence form to tone down her negative response. The interrogative is used with the illocutionary force of an *assertion or complaint*, with perhaps the intended perlocution of getting the hearer to desist in his line of speech. A possible reformulation of her reaction could be: 'You know that you as a Jew cannot expect this of a Samaritan.' The representation of the author of the reaction of the woman is a plausible one for readers in the light of the context in which the conversation is supposedly taking place. Thus, viewed at the level of the characters, the woman is doing exactly what is expected within the social context and is in stark contrast with the deviation from the norm by the character Jesus. She has not excluded the possibility of further conversation, but in her answer she has effectively stopped any action on her side.

The logical question to ask at this stage, is why does the author make the character to respond in this way. What is he/she trying to communicate to the readers? We are now on the *level of the author and reader*. By refusing Jesus' request, the woman is pictured as being a true Samaritan, clinging to her beliefs and traditions, and yet in some sense she is not insensitive to Jesus' request. The implications of his request worry her and she tries to communicate this in polite terms. The reader must immediately be able to sense the great distance between Jew and Samaritan and the problems involved, but the employment of this type of speech act in her answer serves to soften her response somewhat. The reader can thus form a positive attitude towards the character of the woman, in spite of her being Samaritan with all the negative connotations this implies. In this way, she is being shown as a 'conservative' or a 'traditional' figure, with Jesus as a more 'liberal' figure, not adhering to the conventions. Quite the opposite of what the readers are expecting. They are used to a

negative depiction of Samaritans, but here the words of the implied author and the utterance of the Samaritan woman point surprisingly in the opposite direction.

The fact that the author is depicting her answer as a reference to the impossibility of complying with Jesus' request, is clearly shown in the next utterance (4:9) made by the implied author in the form of an aside. Because of the somewhat veiled nature of the woman's answer, and the fact that it is in the *interrogative form* it could easily be misinterpreted. The author guards against this possibility by stating in no uncertain terms that Jews and Samaritans have no dealings with each other. The author is actually confirming the woman's views, legitimizing her action and, in fact, is criticizing Jesus' behavior. In terms of the social context, the woman behaves correctly but Jesus does not. The reason for this is that the readers now have to find an answer to this problem. Their own knowledge, the words of a character and the voice of the so far trustworthy author are all in league with each other against the character of Jesus, who is the chief character the readers identify with. Thus the reader is faced with a real dilemma.

The problem for the reader becomes even more acute if the fact is taken into account that this first verbal exchange between Jesus and the Samaritan woman can be considered to be a failure. The author is seriously challenging the reader's perception of Jesus in these opening verses of their conversation — not only is Jesus contravening social and religious rules, he is also unsuccessful in his attempts at conversation. It seems that the author is preparing the readers to answer the following questions: *first* is Jesus in the wrong or are the accepted social customs perhaps wrong?; *secondly*, is the belief correct in that Samaritans are to be avoided?; and *thirdly*, will the conversation with the woman, which began badly, continue to fail? Reader participation is ensured by this depiction of the exchange between Jesus and the woman, partly because the author problematized the situation and partly because the reader is from the beginning forced to evaluate the situation, his/her own beliefs, and the actions and beliefs of the characters. The total perlocution of these verses can be described as that of trying to induce the reader into an evaluative attitude.

(b) Brief summary of 4:7b-9

The very fact that the character Jesus approaches the Samaritan woman is problematic for the readers. In the previous section, the description of the scene recalled the betrothal type scene, and it is in this intertext a necessity that the male figure should approach the female figure and ask for a drink. However, the fact that this indeed happens, is extremely problematic for the readers who identify with Jesus, as the socio-cultural context does not allow for it. The readers are here led to believe that the rules of the intertext are being followed, but again the readers are subjected to a complete alteration of their

expectations. According to the schema of the betrothal type-scene, the female is supposed to comply with the request, but this does not happen. In fact, she refuses. Again the readers are caught off guard by the sudden alteration of the expected events. Moreover, both the woman and the author confirm that, contrary to what the readers have so far discovered about Jesus in the Gospel, his actions are now against all accepted norms. The speech acts of both the characters and the implied author are used here to get the readers to begin to evaluate the whole situation, since the actions of the protagonist with whom they have been supposed to identify, are now opposed to the norms of the situation. The clever use of the intertext also facilitates this aim.

The speech acts put into the mouths of the characters are also significant in the sense that they establish the whole tone of the following conversational interaction. We have shown that Jesus politely introduces the topic, and that the woman also, despite the dilemma Jesus' request presents, is able to keep the CP in tact. The way in which her reply is structured, and her adherence to social and cultural norms projects a rather favorable image of her to readers at the start of the conversation. The image of Jesus is not so favorably presented here, because he is not only shown to be acting contrary to the expected, but his initial approach to the woman fails in that it is not fulfilled, and he is rebuked. The readers are compelled to continue reading in order to solve this intolerable situation.

The speech acts employed here can be summarized in the following way:

v 7b: λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δός μοι πεῖν·

form: imperative

type of illocution: requestive

perlocution: The character Jesus opens the conversation and inducing the woman to furnish water. The author wants the readers to understand that Jesus is acting *contra* the accepted norms. The author wants the readers to recall the intertext of betrothal scenes. The author wants to induce in the readers an evaluative attitude.

v 8: οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσιν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative

perlocution: The author wants the readers to understand why Jesus is alone; delaying tactic to allow information to sink in, thus increasing suspense. The fact that Jesus and the woman are alone also problematizes the situation further.

v 9a: λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρίτις, Πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ πεῖν αἰτεῖς γυναικὸς Σαμαρίτιδος οὐσης;

form: question

type of illocution: constative (disputative)

perlocution: The woman wants to get Jesus to desist in his socio-culturally unacceptable conduct. The author wants the readers to have positive feelings towards the woman and react negatively towards the conduct of Jesus.

v 9b: (οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.)

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: The author wants the readers to accept the position of the woman that Jesus is wrong. The readers are to take an evaluative stance.

(c) 4:10-15: Discussion on life-giving water

Text:

10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν. 11 λέγει αὐτῷ [ἡ γυνή], Κύριε, οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν; 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιεν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτοῦ; 13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πῶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν· 14 ὃς δ' ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, Κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν.

In this sequence, we will discuss the *level of the characters* first, and then the level of the implied author-reader of the whole of 4:10-15, because there are no interruptions by the implied author in this section.

The fact that the above interpretation of the *exchange between the two characters* is correct, is validated by the response of Jesus in 4:10. He accepts the woman's reluctance to draw water for him and does not pursue the topic of her providing for his needs any further. He accepts her expression of the dilemma in which she finds herself and instead switches to the topic of *her* needs. His utterance in 4:10 is significant in a number of ways. *First*, he indicates that he accepts her explanation in 4:9 provisionally, but then he

immediately proceeds to challenge that very statement, blaming it on her inadequate knowledge of God's gift. Her refusal and reluctance to associate with a Jew, are the result of ignorance about the τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ, which has certain implications for her behavior. *Secondly*, Jesus' utterance is in the third person, he does not explicitly state in the first person that he himself is the gift of God and that he is able to give her living water. The third person is used here and not the first because the character Jesus needs to establish his position firmly in this sequence. It is necessary because his right and privilege to be engaged in any kind of exchange with the woman was challenged by her (and of course, by the author). By using a more neutral form to introduce his next program, the character is subtly convincing the other character of his status, because it seems that when the third person is used anaphorically, as it is done here, it is a discourse strategy used to lend credibility to utterances, and the instances referred to in utterances. The more impersonal use can indicate a certain importance, as if even the speaker himself/herself is reluctant to use the first person to refer to himself/herself (see Jenkinson 1987:51-74). *Thirdly*, the use of τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ is also important. The speaker refers to himself (albeit in the third person) as the gift of God. Whatever this term may have meant for the woman, the fact remains that certain religious and metaphysical relevance is attributed to him, which further strengthens his position, his claim to authority and his credibility as speaker. *Fourthly*, the fact that this person is also, without asking her permission, proceeding to offer her something, the living water, necessitates the presupposition that he has the ability and authority to do so. The felicity conditions governing the dialogue here, and of verbal exchanges in general, require this presupposition of having authority/ability when an offer is made.

These four factors taken together can and do have a significant effect on any hearer — the hearer is severely criticized for a lack of relevant knowledge, the person speaking clearly has a position of such importance that it necessitates the use of the third person and he claims to have authority to switch positions around and to provide her with something, while at the same time claiming to hold some office from God. The character Jesus has thus in this first utterance of his new program clearly indicated that although the first exchange failed, he is not to be taken lightly; in fact, that he has real importance, and that he is now in the driving seat and dictating the action, whereas in the first exchange the woman was dictating the action, and her beliefs resulted in her not drawing water. Furthermore, the character Jesus has kept to the CP which ensures the continuation of the exchange. In fact by not directly telling the woman that she is ignorant and wrong, instead he used a *conditional clause*, with the illocutionary force of an *constative* (assertion), and with the intended perlocution of *convincing* her that she is wrong and that he is instead someone of worth. He has very subtly criticized her, but not to the extent that she would take offense. Her continued participation in the dialogue is thus ensured. The

woman's continued interest in the conversation is also ensured by the possibility created in the closing part of the utterance to the effect that she can possibly obtain some of this water.

In 4:11, the woman responds to this. His words have clearly meant something to her. His intended perlocution of convincing her that he is more than a mere strange Jew clearly found its mark, for she responds by calling him κύριε. (Of note here is that the modern printed edition of the Greek text we are using, uses a capital letter to indicate the start of an utterance after a quotation formula. This is also the case with κύριε in the text here. It must be noted that the capital letter is used merely to indicate the start of direct speech, and is not an indication that the woman is addressing Jesus as 'Lord', that is, with a Christological connotation.) This sudden usage is in stark contrast with their first exchange where she did not show any form of respect. This usage is important for a number of reasons. A vocative is indicative of the relationship between speaker and hearer, the status of both, the social interaction, the level of formality and of certain other aspects of the communication (see Combrink 1987:15, 30-31; Wybenga 1984:79-89). It seems to me that κύριε is used here plainly as an indication that Jesus' status is perceived in a new light by the character of the woman, and not with any Christological implications. This is the natural form of respectful address.

This interpretation of the vocative and its implications for the relationship between the two conversationalists here, is based on the way in which we perceived the intended perlocutions in 4:10, the way in which the dialogue was opened, the way in which the woman reacted to the dilemma and the resulting parameters in which the dialogue is conducted, and also on the knowledge that this vocative disappears in this speech situation when the woman feels threatened (4:17). All this excludes the interpretation of the vocative here as disrespectful or even sarcastic. It is, of course, not impossible that this is indeed the case here, but then it would create the necessity of interpreting the previous, and subsequent material in this light. It is our contention that this interpretation is not justified here. (The vocative κύριε, is interestingly enough, not commented on by commentators such as Schnackenburg, Bultmann, Morris, Dodd, Lightfoot, Barrett, Carmichael, Cahill, and so on). Brown (1982,1:170) merely states that 'the Greek *kyrie* means both "Sir" and "Lord"; most likely there is a progression from the one to the other meaning as the woman uses it with increasing respect in vss. 11, 15 and 19', and Brown does not indicate whether he perceives the woman to move from addressing Jesus as 'Sir' to addressing him as 'Lord'. While we take the κύριε to be nothing more than a respectful form of address, the fact that she starts using it is indeed significant. It shows that Jesus' words have had the intended effect and that the woman, now unsure of herself, have begun to regard Jesus with more respect than usually shown to Jews.

The indication of respect immediately elevates Jesus to a position of equal, if not higher, status than that of the woman. She, who has just reprimanded him because of incorrect behavior, is now addressing him, because of the perlocutionary effects of his previous utterance, with much respect. She has thus accepted his words to the effect that he is indeed someone of authority. The position of the vocative at the beginning of a sentence is also indicative of this. (This is true of Afrikaans, English, German, American and French. The validity of this view should, however, be proven for Hellenistic Greek by an examination of texts of the same era, but the scope and nature of this study, which focuses primarily on literary techniques, does not allow for this. It is assumed that it is also the case here).

Although she has already indicated by her use of κύριε that she accepts the possibility of what he has indicated, his ability to carry out his proposed program of action is challenged by the context, and she also airs this view. She takes the ὕδωρ ζῶν to refer to spring water, and because of the context, she thinks him to be referring to the water of the well where they are sitting — and it is practically impossible to draw water from that well without the right equipment, which he clearly does not have. This explains the motivation for the question she subsequently asks. As we have indicated earlier, the whole of her utterance in 4:11f is thrown into a more polite and cautious mode by the use of κύριε. Again she is compelled by her own admittance of the equal/superior position of Jesus to her to keep to the newly created appropriateness conditions for the exchange. She no longer has the freedom to openly challenge or oppose him, and must play by the rules of interpersonal rhetoric. Therefore, she again makes use of indirect speech acts in the form of questions. She asks two questions, but is actually asserting the impossibility of Jesus' proposal and his authority or power to do so, although she does not dare to do so explicitly.

The first question/assertion she makes states that it is impossible to get water from that specific well without assistance. She is thus challenging the assertion Jesus made implicitly that he is in the position to provide *her* with something. She continues and proceeds to challenge Jesus' implications not only on a practical level, but also on a higher level. He has in fact implied that he is the gift of God, that is, someone of high authority with the authority and ability to carry out his proposal. If his *ability* proves to be doubtful, then perhaps his *authority* is also of doubtful nature. That is why she recalls the name of *Jacob* and the comparative μέζων. She calls on the highest authority she knows regarding springs and wells, that is, Jacob. She also distances herself and her tradition from Jesus by the emphatic use of οὐ, ἡμῶν and ἡμῖν, where the first person plural is clearly used in an exclusive sense indicating a distinct group, in opposition by Jesus. He is thus challenged with regard to his authority, by the authority Jacob has shown in giving the well and the water to the people of the region. The excellence of this water is proven by the consumption thereof by not only Jacob himself, but also his sons and cattle. Water which sustained the

patriarchs and all they owned, cannot easily be superseded by another kind of water or well. The interrogative used by the woman also expects 'no' as an answer (μή). The woman then, very politely, is expressing grave doubts as to Jesus' proposition of supplying her with ὕδωρ ζῶν, still taking it to refer to *spring water* or the water of the same spring. If Jacob had to use a dug well to get to the water, so must this stranger. Again it seems that she has effectively countered Jesus' proposition, without endangering the CP or the rules governing this sort of conversation.

The fact that the authority the character Jesus claims to have, does not seem valid is an important denial with which Jesus is addressed, and to which he will return shortly (4:16ff). In terms of speech act theory, what happened was that the woman molded her utterances, which have the *illocutionary force* of *doubting*, into the form of questions. By *doubting* Jesus' words in the way she does, it is clear that there is still the presupposition that the CP is still valid and that Jesus is given the chance of rectifying the problematic situation. She does not reject his statements outright. The *intended perlocution* of her utterances could be to force him to express himself in a better and more open way. Her doubting is actually a *request* for justifying his claims.

That the intended perlocution is actualized is made clear in the following verses (4:13f) where Jesus reacts to the woman's words. Her doubting of his *ability* is the first thing he addresses when he answers. That her intention was not that of merely *demanding plain information* but rather of *doubting*, is confirmed in the way in which he answers. He does not take up the question of *where* he is going to get the water from, nor is he answering the question of his relative status over and against Jacob. Instead he clarifies his usage of ὕδωρ ζῶν by stating that he was not referring to the water in the well (τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου), but to something completely different. The water which he refers to, once it is consumed will not let the partaker thereof thirst again. He has clearly moved from a discussion of the water in the well of Jacob, contrasting it with the water which will not bring about thirst again. The character Jesus' intention is clear from his words, especially when he refers to ζῶν αἰώνιον in the utterance starting with ἀλλὰ. He also again takes up the theme of the well (πηγῇ) in the sense of a spring, that is, that which produces living/running water. However, the words used here to describe Jesus' utterance are the same as those used in the previous discussion, and therefore susceptible to misunderstanding. The fact that he mentions eternity already alludes to his authority, albeit in a very veiled manner. However, it is clear that the reaction of the woman to doubt his ability, is addressed here. Because Jesus is not talking about the water in the well of Jacob, which is inaccessible to him, he must be referring to some other source. This is exactly the same conclusion the woman reaches when she reacts in 4:15. Because it is clear that it was wrong to doubt his ability to get to the water, for the reason that he was not referring to this water, it means that his credibility is again confirmed. The woman accepts Jesus' explanation that she

misunderstood him regarding this specific well, and given no other reason to doubt him, and because of his mentioning eternal life and eternity, she seems willing to trust him. She mistrusted him once on the question of the water in the well and she was shown to be in the wrong. She does not want to take this risk again and grants that the possibility exists that he can have access to a special kind of water. She thus relinquishes her earlier views that he does not have the ability to give such water to her, and now asks for some of this water. This water, although it has certain properties, is still considered by her to be real natural water. She did not understand that Jesus was actually referring to something else. The intended perlocution of Jesus in 4:13f was to bring the woman to understand that he is actually bringing *spiritual* rather than *physical* benefits. The intended perlocution was clearly not realized here, and the communication failed. The switch to another topic was never realized by the woman, and her inability to grasp the meaning of what Jesus had just said, carried with it the total failure of the conversation. On the level of the characters, this program by Jesus to communicate certain things to the woman did not prove to be fruitful and can be considered to have failed.

On the level of the implied author-reader, matters are a bit more complicated. As was indicated earlier, even if a communication program fails on the level of the characters, this does not mean that it has failed on the level of the communication between the implied author and reader. As the characters are engaged in conversation, the readers look on and try to make sense of the whole scene enacted before their very eyes, while at the same time trying to establish what the intended perlocutions of the implied author are when the characters are directed to act and speak in a certain manner.

Because the implied readers of John are well informed right from the beginning regarding the person, work and mission of Jesus, they are in a position to judge and evaluate characters and their actions from a vantage point which the characters often do not have. The character of the Samaritan woman is a good example of this. The readers are knowledgeable about the identity of Jesus, but the character of the woman is clearly not. This is of course fertile ground for irony, for as Culpepper (1987:165-166) states:

The 'silent' communication between author and reader assumes its most intriguing form in the ironies of the gospel. The implied author smiles, winks, and raises his eyebrows as the story is told. The reader who sees as well as hears understands that the narrator means more than he says and that the characters do not understand what is happening or what they are saying.

The phenomenon of irony in the Gospel of John has been treated extensively by Clavier (1959), Jónsson (1965), Wead (1970), MacRae (1973), Duke (1984), Culpepper (1987:165-180), O'Day (1986) and also Kotze (1987), as we have indicated in the first chapter. We can again state that perhaps the more prominent work done on irony in John the studies by MacRae, Duke,

Culpepper and O'Day. Of these studies, the works by Culpepper and Duke can be grouped together, because their aim is to function primarily on a literary level and their treatment of irony is in the context of *literary* interpretation. MacRae, on the other hand, focuses more on questions that pertain to *theological* reasoning and *theological* meaning. The monograph by O'Day is closely aligned to the work of MacRae in the sense that she is chiefly interested in establishing the theological imports of the ironies in John. Her *methodology*, however, is closer to the literary studies of Culpepper and Duke. That there is irony in the conversation with the woman at the well is without doubt, and this forms an integral part of the communication going on between the author and reader. We are offering rather a full account of irony here for two reasons: the first is that our pericope does indeed have some ironies, and it is, therefore, applicable to this study. Secondly, since the Gospel of John abounds with ironies, and we will also explain irony speech act theoretically, it is perhaps advantageous for Johannine scholars to offer a full picture here.

Duke (1984:55-56) in speaking on irony and the function of irony, refers to Muecke's (1969:99-100) identification of the three unexceptionable usages of irony:

It may be used as a verbal device by which a speaker underlines meaning. It may be used as a satirical device to attack some point of view or to expose someone's ignorance or folly. Or irony may be a heuristic device, employed 'to lead one's readers to see that things are not so simple or certain as they seem, or perhaps not so complex or doubtful as they seem'. These three functions rarely appear separately.

Duke does not follow Muecke's proposals exactly and contends that irony has two basic functions: that of positive appeal on readers and that of negative effect on victims. According to Duke (1984:56), the notion of *irony as appeal* includes four aspects.

First, it is very gratifying, 'provided that the ironist is not trading in obscurities, readers are generally delighted to discover that they have been trusted with the task of rising above a rejected surface of meaning in search for a better one' Duke (1984:56).

Secondly, irony also serves to initiate a deeper insight into certain truths. Duke (1984:57) states that 'in the indirect whispering way of irony there is gentle beckoning and powerful persuasion. Perhaps it is in irony's silence that the power resides. Precisely in its restraint from dictation of a literal meaning to its readers, irony moves their minds to an intensively active state and engages them in an open search for solid ground that will make them grateful when they find it'.

Thirdly, and closely allied to the above, it should also be stressed that irony tends to be most effective to people who perceive it and agree at least to some extent with the ironist. 'When its message is in stark contradiction to the reader's own convictions, however, it will have limited effect... when irony is

purposive, however, it may well take such risks [*misunderstanding, rejection JEB*], for when it does succeed, it will achieve a stronger success than any literal statement can assure' (Duke 1984:59).

In the *fourth* place Duke (1984:60) mentions that irony has the effect on readers that they achieve a sense of community. They feel that they are insiders in a situation where only insiders have the knowledge to adequately decipher the actual truths and implications made in the text. Booth (1974:28) says in this regard that in irony 'the building of amiable communities is often far more important than the exclusion of naive victims. Often the predominant emotion when reading stable ironies is that of joining, of finding and communing with kindred spirits'.

In addition to the aspect of *irony as appeal*, Duke (1984:81) also states that irony can be used *as a weapon*, in that it can cruelly mock and deride its victims and the outsiders.

From the above it is clear that irony serves several purposes, and each individual case of irony has to be viewed by itself, to determine its function in the text. These observations made by Booth are confirmed by Roy (1981:409-410) who argues from a speech act theory point of view: 'Irony is a linguistic technique which can be used either as an individual strategy for immediate attention and control or as a strategy to build or display group solidarity. This dual function is closely linked to the dual effect of irony, that is, that it can be felt as either negative or positive, and sometimes ambiguously as either or both.'

O'Day (1986:31-32) stresses the fact that the chief function of irony, in addition to the effects discussed above, is to reveal.

The traditional approach to irony followed by Duke (1984) and O'Day (1986) can be supplemented by insights from speech act theory, where the use of conversational rules and felicity conditions can account for a number of factors in which the more traditional approaches seem too limited. Traditionally irony has been explained as *either* saying something other than what is meant *or* saying the opposite of what is meant. This means that the *opposition* is located in individual *lexical items* or in *propositions*, such as in the sentence: 'Well done!' when something was done badly. However, there are instances where the irony cannot be located lexically or propositionally, as in the sentences quoted by Roy (1981:412): 'That was a curb you just drove over'. She remarks on this sentence (her 6):

In (6) the maxim of quality is observed, but the maxim of quantity: *say as much as, but not more than, is necessary* is violated, because the speaker tells the hearer what is obvious or already known to the hearer. This violation occurs because Searle's condition on *telling*, that the speaker tell the hearer something that he does not know but that the speaker believes he wants to know, is not observed [Roy's italics].

This leads to the notion of *pragmatic opposition* which is an extension of the above-mentioned *predicative opposition*. By stating it in this way, the traditional

definition of irony as 'saying the opposite of what is meant' can still remain valid, but is not so broad as to include utterances where something else is meant by what is said (see Gordon and Lakoff 1971). Roy (1981:413) states that there is *pragmatic* opposition when 'there is a surface mismatch between the experience and the appropriateness of the articulation about the experience'. This means that a speaker engaged in irony must assume that the hearer is able to perceive that irony is involved, that the hearer is able to interpret the utterance, and that the hearer will strive to determine what the speaker means. According to Roy (1981:413), these assumptions 'reflect the pragmatic competence of both speaker and hearer'.

This means that a speaker who engages in irony expects the hearer or reader to engage in some additional activity, because the utterance is a non-literal one, and the author/speaker also has to make some extra interpretations in creating a situation in which the hearer/reader can calculate correctly what is being said.

These observations imply that any consideration of irony must take a number of factors into consideration, such as shared knowledge about social systems and customs, conversational rules, contextual knowledge, and knowledge about speech acts (see Amante 1981:80; Du Plessis, T 1987:203-209; Bach & Harnish 1979:5-11,70; Grice 1975a:49-53; and Kaufer 1981:500). This lends some new insights into the function and mechanics of irony and how it operates within discourses. The advantages for the study of a literary device such as irony (which occurs so frequently in John) in this way, is enormous, and some very interesting and new insights into the dynamics of language usage in context can be obtained. In John 4, irony which involves propositional opposition, is found, while in some other contexts in John irony which involves pragmatic opposition, can be identified. In these instances, the insights of speech act theory can greatly assist in identifying and interpreting these texts.

In addition to the use of irony in this section, the concepts of *ambiguity* and *misunderstanding* are also present in the text. Culpepper (1987:161-165), Duke (1984:88-90), Wead (1970:30-46, 69-71) have commented on the use of misunderstandings as a *quasi* literary device. In this specific section, the misunderstanding concerns basically the words ἵδωρ ζῶν, which the woman in the story misunderstands. However, Wead (1970:69-70) correctly states that although misunderstanding is an extremely important technique in John, it must be recognized that 'it is not truly a literary device, but merely a technique by which the more precise meanings and other literary devices of the author are revealed more clearly to his reader'.

The notion that misunderstanding often facilitates the use of irony is also confirmed by Culpepper (1987:164-165), when he argues that misunderstandings, like irony, have the effect of grouping the readers with the 'insiders', and also serve the purpose of indicating ironies to the readers.

The implementation of irony and misunderstanding in 4:10-15 makes it clear that, although the communication between Jesus and the Samaritan woman is

rather unsuccessful on the story level, the author is achieving exceptional results with the readers on the level of the communication with them.

In 4:10, the author starts winking at the readers by using the terms τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ and ὕδωρ ζῶν, together with the fact that the focus is now switched from Jesus' need to that of the woman. The readers know what the woman does not know, and are consequently confirmed in their beliefs, that is, that Jesus is the gift of God and that he has access to the ὕδωρ ζῶν. It does not seem plausible that there is a possibility that the *readers* could misunderstand the term 'living water' — the whole situation excludes such a literal interpretation of the words. The fact that Jesus is alone at the well, that his disciples have gone, and that he has asked for a drink, implies that he does not have the means to obtain real water himself. If the CP is being observed, as the readers can rightly assume, then the obviously unsuitable utterance of the character to the effect that he can provide water, which represents a breaking of the maxim of quality (see Pratt 1977:130) by the Jesus character, compels the readers to infer some other meaning from that which was stated. The fact that he does not refer to real water is in this way signalled to the readers, especially if the whole of the utterance is taken into consideration. The fact that the roles are suddenly reversed, that the question of his identity and the gift of God are relevant here, all of which are well known to the readers, makes a literal interpretation by the readers impossible. The readers are immediately elevated to a level which the Samaritan woman cannot attain. They know what Jesus is referring to, and thus the irony of her words in 4:11f is heightened when she, in her answer, clearly indicates that she misunderstands his words and takes them to refer to literal water. The author and the readers are 'insiders', but more than that, they are in accord with the character of Jesus himself. In addition, the author and readers being able to identify with each other, the chief aim is to get the readers to identify with Jesus and indirectly with every other group of people or individuals who also share the same insight. By using the misunderstanding here, the author has created a distinct group of people or a community, with which he/she has allowed the readers to align themselves. The perlocution of the utterance of the woman shows on the story level that it is a failure, on the level of the implied author and reader it creates a sense of belonging, of belonging to a group who understands Jesus correctly. In addition, this the fact that some interpretative activity is required of the audience/readers to calculate the exact implication, serves to facilitate understanding and the formulation in their own minds of exactly what is referred to. These could be key theological statements, questions of identity and so on. In this instance, the author is actually requesting his/her readers to start contemplating the theme of living water, something which will be taken up again later (see 7:38). According to Culpepper (1987:165), the most important of the functions of misunderstandings is

to teach the readers how to read the gospel. The misunderstandings call attention to the gospels' metaphors, double-entendres and plurisignations.... Readers are therefore oriented to the level on which the gospel's language is to be understood and warned that failure to understand identifies them with the characterization of the Jews and the others who cannot interpret the gospel's language correctly.

To this one can perhaps add that, while it is true that in the Gospel of John it sometimes does not matter who the group or person is who misunderstands the words of Jesus (see Culpepper 1987:162), it does seem significant that one understands the Samaritan woman to be the victim here. One reason for this is that the author has carefully made sure, by repetition and action on her side, that the reader is in no doubt that the Samaritan woman is actually a representation of the Samaritans as a group. At this stage the readers and Jesus, as an 'insider' group are contrasted with the Samaritans as an 'outsider' group. The effect of this use of language is that the Samaritans are seen rather negatively. This is also necessary because of the effect of the utterances in the previous section where the woman is pictured rather favorably in the sense that she acts politely, and adheres to the required socio-cultural modes of conduct, while Jesus is actually criticized by the implied author. This situation has to be rectified and this explains the use of such a powerful literary device as irony.

The misunderstanding continues in 4:12, and the ironies in the words of the woman become apparent, as Duke (1984:109-110) clearly indicates:

The pronoun: *οὗ* is emphatic; the particle *μή* signals negative expectation: 'You aren't greater than Jacob, are you?' That would be irony enough, but the woman's every word heightens the hidden meaning of the question.... The superiority of Jesus as gift and giver is unconsciously emphasized further when the woman elaborates upon the sufficiency of the well, which satisfied Jacob 'and his sons and his cattle' — a bountiful well indeed! 'You aren't greater than such a provider, are you?' she asks the stranger whose gift is 'a spring of water welling up to eternal life' (v 14) [Duke's italics]

Again it must be stated that, while the character of the woman is actually expressing something completely different in meaning, the irony of her words serves to strengthen the bonds between author and reader, and their identification with Jesus. Jesus' identity becomes that much clearer to them because they have to construe from the author's flouting of the maxim of quality, using the words of the woman, the true situation about his identity. The woman is stating an obvious untruth when she says that Jesus is not greater than Jacob.

The speech act principle involved in irony is the principle of flouting. Because the readers trust the author to keep the CP intact, the fact that the truth as they know it is contradicted via the words of the Samaritan woman, does not mean that communication between author and reader has broken down. They sense that the author is *flouting* the maxim, not breaking it, and therefore they can deduce that the intent of the utterance is irony. This flouting takes place when the woman is in fact implying that Jesus is not greater than

Jacob. In the context of the Gospel, this is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. The fact that she emphasizes that Jacob is 'our father' is also a misrepresentation of the truth — Jacob is a revered patriarch for both the Samaritans and the Jews. Also the fact that the *sentence type* excludes any other answer but 'no' is flouting the essence of a question. The maxim of quality ('Do not say which you believe to be false'), is transgressed by the author. The readers can easily detect that he/she is flouting this maxim, and that the real truth is still being observed by the implied author. This means that the truth is exactly the opposite to what is being said and this is, in essence, ironical (see also Leech 1983:142-149 and Roy 1981).

In this way, speech-act theory also explains the enormous force of irony discussed above, and the concept of insiders and outsiders. Because of the fact that there is a conversation between author and reader certain rules are observed, and if you play by the rules, it means that you are an *insider*, knowledgeable about what is happening in the discussion. Those who obviously do not know the rules cannot play the game and, therefore, are a group in themselves, opposed to the insiders. The *effect* of irony on the readers can also be explained in terms of speech act theory — the theory requires full participation and involvement in the conversation between author and reader. The calculations necessitated by irony and misunderstanding mean that the reader is extremely involved with the story and is not just required to be attentive and absorb information. Rather, the author expects the reader to assign meaning actively to the text. Roy (1981:413-414) remarks on the roles of the participants in irony that 'the hearer has extra work to do in processing irony, in comparison with decoding nonironic utterances... and furthermore that the speaker not only expects the hearer to do this work, but in fact also sets up a situation (however unconsciously) where the hearer has to do the extra work in order to stay with the interaction'. The author is leading the reader towards an understanding by his/her choice of words and images, but once the images are grasped, they become the property of the reader, because he/she has produced them. His/her own contribution is, therefore, much greater and one hopes, more lasting. This is a very powerful tool in the hands of the author to ensure the readers' involvement in the story.

The author, pre-empting the possibility that the expression used could perhaps also have been misconstrued by certain less sensitive readers, helps the readers in 4:13f to completely understand what the character is referring to. The explanation of the nature of the water Jesus is offering is so thorough that it is doubtful whether it is plausible that the woman could actually have misunderstood it. Yet the author clearly allows the character of the woman to do just that in 4:15. The author does not intend the woman to grasp the meaning of the words, since the aim is actually the *failure* of the conversation in 4:10-15. But at the same time, the author is also making sure that the readers do not follow in the woman's footsteps. It is necessary to do this because of the

very positive depiction of her actions in 4:7-9 where she repeatedly shows that she is acting correctly and Jesus is not doing the right thing. This could also explain the use of irony to create a distance between the readers and the woman. By grouping the '*insiders*' against the '*outsiders*' the author has made sure that the readers do not duplicate the woman's wrong ideas in their own minds.

In 4:13-14, the author again makes sure that the readers do not follow the woman by emphatically explaining via the words of Jesus what was meant earlier. The readers are supposed to pick that up, not the character of the woman. The necessity for this fuller explanation has probably arisen because of the covert nature of irony. Irony is meant especially for perceptive readers, and this implies the risk, that in some instances it will not be perceived or shared. Repeated reading is one way of helping readers to become aware of ironies, but also the program of explaining a previous misunderstanding or irony helps the 'slower' reader to catch up. This is especially important if the information which is communicated by means of the irony, is of great importance, as it is the case here (see also Duke 1984:179).

It is important in the reading of the story that the readers are, at this stage, aware of what is going on, because very soon the characters embark on a new program starting at 4:16 where there will be significant developments. The author has given the readers the pleasure of discovering the ironies and misunderstandings for themselves, but has also carefully ensured that there is no possible doubt in the minds of the readers as to the actual state of affairs.

The response of the Samaritan woman in 4:15 signals to the readers that she has not grasped the implications of the words of Jesus as they have. She is still alien to them as a group, and this explains the failure of the conversation so far. However, her acceptance of the switch to *her* needs from those of Jesus is also significant. This creates the possibility of the continuation of the conversation, since the need still lacks fulfillment. The readers can rightly expect the conversation to continue. Her utterance in the form of a request implies the following for the readers: the *situation* has changed somewhat in the sense that whereas the woman did not accept Jesus' claims previously, she is now accepting it, at least on a limited scale. She has actually authorized Jesus to carry on and is thus indicating that she accepts, at least to some degree, that he is in a position to do so. He has access to the water, it is of a special kind, and he has the ability to get it — all factors which she previously denied. The author's intended perlocution via the utterance of the woman is not only to show her misunderstanding as typical of Samaritans, but also to set the scene for the rest of the conversation and to orientate the readers to acceptance of what is to follow, by showing covertly that although the conversation fails to a certain extent, there has still been some progress.

(d) Brief summary of 4:10-15

First, the communication between the characters is discussed. After the refusal of the woman, the character Jesus again takes the initiative and introduces a switch in the conversation. The focus now shifts from the needs of Jesus to those of the woman. From the speech acts employed by the character Jesus, it is clear that the difficult situation in which he found himself in the previous section, needs to be rectified. He refers to her inadequate knowledge, his special relationship to God, and the fact that if she had adequate knowledge she would ask him for water of a special kind. The impact of the way in which this is communicated to her results in her accepting his position of (possible) higher authority, as her use of *κύριε* indicates. She questions both his *ability* ('the well is deep' and 'where will you get the water?') and his *authority* in making these claims by referring to the greatness of Jacob which will be hard to surpass. Although her utterance in 4:12 is in the form of an interrogative, it has the illocutionary force of a constative (disputative) in which she actually challenges him to prove otherwise.

Jesus reacts to this challenge by indicating that the water he is offering is not of the same kind as that presupposed by the woman. Because this water is of a different nature, her questions regarding his ability and relative authority compared with Jacob are no longer valid. The full description of this water in 4:14 confirms its special nature. However, the woman does not understand that he is referring to water of a spiritual kind, and takes his utterance to refer to real water. Because the properties of this water are so desirable she asks for this water. However, her reasons for requesting it clearly indicate that the communication between her and Jesus has failed. She does not understand him at all. Just like the communication failed in 4:7b-9, it fails here.

Despite the fact that the intended results have not been realized, there has at least been some development in the relationship between Jesus and the woman. He has assumed a position of relative authority, which she has accepted. She has accepted the change from his needs to hers, and her request in 4:15 indicates this. All this still leaves the possibility open for further conversation between the two of them, although the discussion has not been very successful so far.

Regarding the communication between *implied author and readers*, it is significant to note that this whole section is aimed at re-establishing the position of Jesus in the eyes of the implied readers. In the previous section, he did all the wrong things, and the readers' reactions towards him were thrown into turmoil. The criticism of the woman and the implied author is immediately addressed by the veiled reference to Jesus' identity. The reference is veiled on the character level, but not on the readers' level. They know exactly who Jesus is, and the implied author reminds them of this fact by letting Jesus refer to it. The senselessness of challenging Jesus' conduct is also elucidated when it

becomes apparent that he is the gift of God and is actually interested in the woman's needs. Her misunderstanding of ὕδωρ ζῶν and the irony of her words further serve the purpose of realigning the readers with Jesus. The woman as a victim of misunderstanding and irony is cast as an outsider, while the readers and Jesus constitute the group of the insiders. The author is manipulating the readers here: in the first instance they could do little but be negative towards Jesus, and here they are being manipulated by providing them with irony they can understand, into feeling one with the character Jesus. The woman's misunderstanding and ironical remarks also force the readers to reformulate the correct views regarding Jesus in discovering the ironies. Irony is used here in a very clever way to achieve a certain perlocutionary aim.

To ensure that even the least attentive reader will follow the consequences, the author explains through the mouth of Jesus exactly what is meant by his words. By using the concept of water from the immediate context, the mission and identity of Jesus are summarized for the sake of the readers. Although no new information regarding Jesus' mission is offered, these utterances serve to throw the whole dialogue into a different light in the perception of the reader. Whereas Jesus' approaching the woman felt completely wrong at first, the situation is now rectified to some extent.

The woman's continued misunderstanding of Jesus indicates that the whole conversation needs to continue in order to obtain a satisfactory result, and the readers are invited to read on. There is also the added satisfaction of the readers as insiders in understanding exactly what Jesus means, as opposed to the continued depiction of the woman as an ignorant outsider. If she is indeed a representative of the Samaritan group, then the content and tenor of the second half of the dialogue are not difficult to understand.

The speech acts employed in this section are as follows:

v 10: ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The character Jesus intends the woman to change her initial evaluation of him, wants her to recognize his superior position. The author intends the readers again to perceive Jesus positively.

v 11a: λέγει αὐτῷ [ἡ γυνή], Κύριε, οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ·

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (informative)

perlocution: The character of the woman intends Jesus to understand that what he is proposing is impossible. The author intends the readers, through the misunderstanding of the woman, to feel closer to Jesus than to the woman and wants to invoke in them a positive attitude towards Jesus.

v 11b: πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν;

form: question

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The character of the woman is, by asserting the impossibility of Jesus' proposal trying to convince him of the fact. The intended perlocution of the author is much the same as above.

v 12: μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιεν καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτοῦ;

form: question

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The character of the woman is trying to make Jesus see or feel his inferiority compared with Jacob's. The author wants the readers, through the irony of the woman's words to feel like knowledgeable insiders against the woman (and her group) as outsiders. Thus: positive feelings towards Jesus and negative feelings towards the Samaritans.

v 13f: ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πῶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν· 14 ὃς δ' ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (informative)

perlocution: The character Jesus wants the woman to believe that the water he brings is superior in nature. She is to ask for this spiritual gift. The author wants the readers to be sure that they understand the previous words of Jesus and the irony of the woman's words.

v 15: λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, Κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν.

form: imperative

type of illocution: directive (requestive)

perlocution: The the woman indicates her partial acceptance of Jesus' claims, and her desire for him to act on his words, by allowing him to proceed. It is signaled to the readers that the dialogue so far is a failure, and necessarily to continue.

2.5.2 4:16-26 The second half of the dialogue

(a) 4:16-26: The topic under discussion changes

Text:

16 Λέγει αὐτῇ, Ὑπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε. 17 ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνή καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Καλῶς εἶπες ὅτι Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω. 18 πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες, καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν σου ἀνὴρ· τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας. 19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, Κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ. 20 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ. 21 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πίστευέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί. 22 ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἶδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. 23 ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρί ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτόν. 24 πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτόν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. 25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα. 26 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.

In this section, we will again distinguish between the two levels of conversation present in the text, and discuss each separately. We will begin our discussion with *the story level*

This particular verse (4:16) has presented interpreters with considerable difficulties because of its sudden and abrupt nature. Explanations for this are quite varied. Carmichael (1980:338), who contends that this scene is a scene loaded with sexual and marital overtones, states that 'this switch in conversation would be inexplicable if it were not for the underlying marital theme. The woman by requesting the gift of living water is becoming, in a sense for the first time a bride for the bridegroom'.

Carmichael comes to this interpretation because for him water can be used figuratively to refer to a woman as a wife (Carmichael 1980:337). Basically the same interpretation is followed by Eslinger (1987:178). Olsson (1974:184) refers to quite a number of interpretations of this very troublesome utterance and states that most scholars read this and the following utterances as a sort of 'leading' of the woman in which her faith is tested, her conscience is awakened, and her loose living criticized. Other scholars contend that this utterance reveals Jesus' omniscience.

A few other possible explanations are referred to by O'Day (1986:131), such as the view of Bernard (1929:143) that we only have fragments of the original conversation, and the view of Lindars (1972:185) that it is a ploy of Jesus to make the woman understand that he is not speaking about real water. However, O'Day considers that these and other explanations are not adequate in explaining the sudden change. O'Day (1986:66) herself proposes an explanation on the grounds of the usage of the spatial references and her views on irony and the use of this in both 4:15 and 16 this is intended to focus the readers' attention on the woman's ignorance about the origin of the gifts of Jesus, and so 'the Samaritan woman has identified the gift of water with a place, and does not understand that the gift is dependent on the giver, not on any well'.

To my mind, O'Day's explanation does not hold water, so to speak! It does not explain the sudden change of topic, and more significantly, it is definitely not clear that the woman has identified the gift of water with a place. Furthermore, there is no clear-cut evidence that she does not understand that the gift is dependent on the giver and not on any well. On the contrary, the woman does indeed understand that the water is not dependent on any place, that is why she wants the water, so that she does not need to return to any specific place. Moreover, it is not true that she does not understand that the giver is the important agent and not a well — how else can one explain her request for water from the person Jesus. She asks him, and does not request knowledge of any other source where the water can be obtained. One must conclude that O'Day's explanation is also not adequate.

Others, like Morris (1981:264) and Hendriksen (1976:164), find the logic behind the utterance in the fact that the woman is a sinful person and that her sins must be revealed. There are, however, no indications in the preceding section to indicate a problematic past for her; except perhaps the fact that she visited the well at an unc customary hour. However, there is nothing in the text there to indicate this. The reference to her fetching water is probably the result of the author's strategy to invoke the intertext of the betrothal scene. Her problematic life style becomes clearer in the next section, but this still does not explain the sudden change and the abrupt break in the conversation. The fact that her sin is never mentioned or this fact exploited any further in the dialogue also supports this view.

Despite the fact that all commentators on this particular verse have indicated that it is a rather strange twist in the conversation, none of them has adequately or convincingly offered a solution for this. Most interpretations focus on the level of the interaction between reader and author, although the explanations are not articulated in this way. An exception is Okure (1988:104) who states that 4:16 'betrays a sense of frustration on Jesus' part'. The two levels of communication in the text with which we are dealing here, have so far never been adequately addressed or distinguished in interpretations. Because speech act theory necessitates this distinction and treats conversations between characters as utterances complying with the rules of natural conversation, it can perhaps offer some suggestions which were up till now not available to New Testament exegetes for understanding this difficult verse. What makes the solution we offer here attractive is the fact that it is a very simple explanation, but one which inherently also allows for the possibilities mentioned by previous interpreters.

Grice (1975a:45) has proposed the CP which as the ultimate maxim, states that anyone engaged conversation is obliged to make his/her contribution in accordance with the requirements of the conversation and the stage reached in the conversation, keeping the purposes and direction of the conversation in mind. This CP is supported by the general maxims of quantity quality, manner and relevance. McLaughlin (1984:32) states:

Conversational behavior that appears to violate or blatantly flout the maxims ordinarily gives rise to speculation as to why the cooperative principle does not appear to be in force, and this state of affairs invites *conversational implicature*, broadly construed the engagement of a set of interpretive procedures designed to figure out just what the speaker is up to [McLaughlin's italics].

Take, for example, two conversationalists who are engaged for some time in a discussion of a mutual colleague, who suddenly approaches A from the back and A says: 'Don't you think that Fred sometimes acts like an idiot?', to which B replies: 'I planted some shrubs yesterday'. In order to make sense of B's utterance A must make a number of inferences on the basis of assumptions about rules and principles of conversation which they both share. This is, of course, done automatically and subconsciously, but could perhaps be explained in the words of A as: 'B violated the maxim of relevance, but so far in the conversation he has very cooperative. For some reason B has chosen to flout the maxim, and therefore indicated that he does not want to pursue the topic any further. He is telling me he does not want to talk any more about this particular subject, and that I should follow his example.' If A turns around and sees Fred, the reason for B's flouting of the maxim will become clear to him.

It seems that the dynamics of the conversation in 4:15f go along much of the same lines. This is the most likely explanation of the difficulties 4:16 presents to interpreters. The fact that the woman completely misunderstood Jesus became

very clear in the preceding verses. The character Jesus does not want to pursue the issue, or the misunderstanding of the issue, any further and signals this to his hearer, the woman. The signal he gives to indicate an unwillingness to continue on the level of current conversation is, however, not a rude one. The politeness principle is still being observed and the CP is not jeopardized at all. This 'break' also affords the character Jesus an opportunity to continue the conversation and to introduce a new topic or program in his dealings with the woman. By breaking the relevance maxim, the speaker creates a gap or break in the logic of the conversation and the participants in the conversation have to make sense of this by means of conversational implicature.

That the intended perlocution ('do not pursue this issue further, what about this') indeed strikes home with the character of the woman is clear from her reply in 4:17 where she does not press Jesus again to provide her with the water, but rather acknowledges his refusal to continue the subject of water and reacts to his newly introduced topic. She reacts by stating that she has no husband. The utterance has the illocutionary force of a constative, asserting something, in this case denying that she has a husband. The perlocution or intended perlocution could be explaining her inability to comply with the imperative of Jesus. The fact that she has in 4:15 acknowledged that Jesus has the ability and authority to do some things which she cannot, places Jesus in a somewhat authoritative position in relation to her. The rules of this conversation have changed so that Jesus, in order to give an order, must be in a position to do so, and that the one who receives the order must be subordinate. These rules have slowly but surely been established so far by the use of the language. This is the reason why the woman does not question his right to give a command, but merely responds and explains why she is unable to do so. From the later parts of the conversation, one can deduce that the command by Jesus was interpreted as referring to a *husband*. This meaning of *ἀνὴρ* is taken up by the woman in her reply that she is unable to fulfill the request of Jesus, and it supplies an acceptable and indisputable reason for this.

What is also significant here is that the woman does not use *κύριε* to address Jesus as she had done previously. It is important to note this fact, because the presence or absence of the vocative can be indicative of a change in attitude or of situation. The fact that the woman does not use the vocative in the beginning of the exchange, is hardly surprising, because the situation of the meeting at the well between total strangers dictates a more formal, and less informal approach. The less harsh attitude of the woman and the acceptance of Jesus's superior position are clearly indicated by her repeated use of *κύριε* so far. However, in this situation, the rules of the conversation dictate that she should regard, and thus address Jesus with even more respect. This is because of the position she allowed him to take up in the previous section and her acknowledgement of this situation. The absence here of a (by now expected) vocative constitutes a breach of the conversational rules. This breach could be indicative of a subtle

change in her attitude or in the relationship between them. In this case, it signals that the utterance of the woman is not unproblematic in nature — it perhaps signals a change in her perception of the character of Jesus from someone who can offer her something to someone who constitutes a threat to her. The absence of the vocative serves to make the conversation slightly more formal and increases the distance between the participants somewhat (see also Combrink 1987:15-41). The importance of the absence of the vocative κύριε is also confirmed by the fact that, in the subsequent exchanges the woman again takes up the explicit vocative in 4:19, when it is clear that Jesus does not present a threat to her. This interpretation would exclude the views held by *inter alia* Bligh (1962:335-336), Carmichael (1980:338-343), and Eslinger (1987:178) that the woman has designs of marriage or intercourse with Jesus behind her denial.

In 4:17b, Jesus responds to the woman's denial of having a husband. The character Jesus here shows his omniscience — an aspect which would present no problem to readers and which is in concert with the characterization of Jesus which has been presented so far. He judges her to speak the truth, and stresses this by mentioning it *twice*, in the *beginning* and at the *end* of his utterance — first by utilizing *καλῶς* and secondly by *ἀληθές*. This is in sharp contrast with the content of the utterance which these two sayings frame. The use of *ἀληθές* and *καλῶς* has led some interpreters such as Okure (1988:109) and O'Day (1986:67) to believe that the utterance by Jesus is of an ironical nature. This is, however, not the case since no break in conversational or propositional rules can be detected here, nor is there any conflict between what is *said* and what is *meant*. We must conclude that the function of the utterance is not that of irony. Furthermore, the fact that she may be an immoral person is stressed by interpreters such as Olsson (1974:186), Schnackenburg (1965:468; 1968:433), Carmichael (1980:338), Bultmann (1957:138; 1971:188), Brown (1982,1:171) and many others. They do so because of the fact that in Jewish circles it was considered undesirable or even immoral to marry more than three times.

However, despite the fact that the statement is made, the implications of her immoral life are not exploited any further. Therefore it seems that here on the story level or the level of the characters, this information given by Jesus serves another purpose: that of revealing to the character of the woman what Jesus and the readers already know, that is, that Jesus's identity has something to do with his omniscience. The view that the utterance by Jesus does not have the illocutionary force of an accusation or even a rejection by a person, is further confirmed by the obvious stressing of the fact that the woman is speaking the truth, in the beginning and at the end of the utterance. Further confirmation of this view is found in the fact that this careful formulation of her undesirable past is in accordance with the *approbation maxim* of the politeness principle (minimize dispraise of other/maximize praise of other). This ensures the continued conversation between the characters, despite the fact that the woman is caught lying and that this fact is revealed. The thesis that the woman's

immoral life is not relevant on the *story level* is also confirmed by the fact that the *approbation maxim* usually occurs only in *assertives* and *expressives* according to Leech (1983:132), and the illocutionary force of the utterance here is indeed that of asserting.

Continued support for this view is found in the fact that the woman's next statement the perlocutionary effect, as the author intends it for this character. She does not react by defending herself or trying to justify herself, but by acknowledging the fact that Jesus' utterance has revealed something of his person and identity. We can thus contend that on the level of the *story*, her immoral past does not play any other role than that of revealing Jesus' true identity. This does not, however, mean that on the level of the communication between author and reader the function of the utterance is the same, or that her immoral past does not play a role. Quite the contrary, but we will discuss this when we deal with the level of the implied author/reader. The fact that the discussion between the two characters from 4:16 onwards focuses strongly on the identity of Jesus as revealer is also stressed by Okure (1988:107-113). She also states that 'there is no indication in the passage that the Evangelist intends to present Jesus as confronting the woman with her sinful life' (Okure 1988:110). This is also the view of Haenchen (1980:242) and Westcott (1954:71).

The woman's reaction in 4:19 also indicates that her defensive stance in 4:17 has now been replaced by an adherence to the rules of a conversation between an inferior and a superior. She again uses the vocative *κύριε* which indicates that she has accepted Jesus' veiled criticism not as a criticism but actually as a statement of fact regarding his identity (assertive). She identifies Jesus as a prophet, for in the context of the Samaritan belief only prophets could have superior knowledge (see, for instance, Schnackenburg 1965:468-469; 1968:434; Brown 1982,1:17; Barrett 1978:236). Olsson (1974:187) states that it is the only time in the dialogue that the woman actually expresses a belief in Jesus and that this inevitably leads to the question regarding the religious differences between Jews and Samaritans. The fact that she calls Jesus a prophet has the implication that he also speaks the words of God and 'from the Samaritan point of view, it is natural to expect that a true prophet of God will reveal the right as regards the very heart of the conflict between Samaritans and Jews: which is the legitimate cult site, Gerizim or Jerusalem?' (Olsson 1974:187).

There have, of course, been other explanations for the woman's sudden switch from the identification of Jesus as a prophet, to the topic of worship. For instance, Duke (1984:103) argues that she is changing the topic to escape from Jesus' probing. Hoskyns (1940:243) suggests that she is inquiring as to the right place where to obtain forgiveness. O'Day (1986:67-68) agrees with Olsson that the very fact that they are standing near a Samaritan holy site and that Jesus has made it clear that he is a (Jewish) prophet, would adequately explain her

mention of worship. Her acknowledgement of Jesus as a prophet can thus be linked both textually and semantically to the question of worship.

In 4:20 the form of the woman's utterance is that of a *statement*, yet it has the illocutionary force of a *question*, which is confirmed by Jesus' response in 4:21. Olsson (1974:188) finds it 'odd' that no question is asked and that the different attitudes are only stated. The difficulty experienced by Olsson is not so problematic if one keeps in mind that speech act theory allows for the fact that a certain form of sentence or utterance can be used for any other type of speech act. In this instance, a statement is used for a question. The woman asks this prophet which she has discovered about the correct place of worship, but still very much continues to stress the polarity between Jews and Samaritans (see the emphatic ὑμεῖς and οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν). On the reference to Gerizim as the place of worship of the Samaritans, see Barrett (1978:236); Brown (1982,1:171); Carmichael (1980:338); Olsson (1974:1898) and the literature referred to there.

The woman is suggesting two clear alternatives — either the Jews are correct or the Samaritans are in the right. The one possibility excludes the other. Furthermore, she also assumes that the place of worship is either Jerusalem or Gerizim — that is, a specific location. Although she has made much progress in her perception of Jesus in the sense that she recognizes him as a prophet, she still does not grasp his identity to the full and subsequently continues to pursue the matter of worship in terms of location and the fence between Jew and Samaritan. However, her question indicates that the opposition between herself and Jesus is at a minimum, for she proposes a program where they both search for answers together.

Her question affords the character Jesus the opportunity to elaborate on the nature of true worship in 4:21-24, the longest speech of this character in chapter 4:1-42. Previously the character Jesus has not addressed the woman with a specific vocative. Here he uses γύναι. The function of such a sudden use can be ascribed to the fact that Jesus states in a very serious manner that what he is about to say is of extreme importance. The use of γύναι here is interpreted differently. Duke (1984:161) states that it can also mean 'wife' as in other Greek literature, but he himself is not convinced that this is the case here. Brown (1982,1:172) takes it to be a courteous form of address, Barrett (1978:236) assumes it to be a neutral form of address. Despite these observations, it does seem strange that the form of address is used here for the first time. To my mind the form of address and the πιστευέ μοι must be taken as one utterance. Again we find that although the *imperative* form is used here, the illocutionary force of the utterance is far from it. The illocutionary force of this utterance is to *convince* or *assure* the woman of the truth. Because of the importance of the assurance, it is necessary to utilize a more formal form of address, hence the γύναι. (Assurances are more formal forms of speech behavior). This type of utterance can be described as a *preventative*. Hewitt and Stokes (1975) propose a number of ways in which people deal *prospectively*

(as opposed to retrospectively) with the possibility that an utterance violates certain conversational or contextual rules. Whenever this happens the identities of the participants in a conversation become of extreme importance:

The thematic organization of meaning by interactants usually depends upon their ability to interpret each other's actions as manifestations of particular identities. It follows that when events fail to fit themes in interaction, identities may come into focus as problematic: if the acts of another fail to appear sensible in light of his identity in the situation, perhaps he is not who he appears to be.

(Hewitt and Stokes 1975:2)

They identify a number of disclaimers which are used to guard a speaker's identity in a problematic situation. The disclaimer possibly applicable here is the *cognitive disclaimer*, where the speaker assures his/her audience that although the utterance may sound strange or discrediting, this is in fact not the case. The character Jesus is about to make an utterance which could be interpreted negatively, because of the implications of its content, or because it opposes the woman's previous remarks and thus in effect challenges her statement. McLaughlin (1984:202) states that the *function* of a disclaimer is to 'mark an upcoming utterance as candidate basis for negative typification, and ask for the hearer's indulgence'. The importance and the possible negative effects of Jesus' pending utterance necessitates a pre-emptive move on his side to ensure that it is well received.

The fact that this disclaimer is necessary, becomes clear when the character Jesus continues with his explanation and immediately contradicts the woman's own belief, and indirectly, the common belief of both Jews and Samaritans. He violates the *maxim of quality*, as it is perceived by the characters and as the context dictates. A maxim proposed by Edmondson (1981a) called a 'hearer-supportive' maxim, and which states that the hearers' costs and beliefs should be supported and not one's own, is also in jeopardy here. The problem of violating *at least* two maxims compels the speaker, in this case Jesus, to use the disclaimer.

Jesus begins to answer the woman by taking up the theme of worship, but radically changes the temporal dimension of the worship. The Samaritan woman uses the *past* and *present* tenses to depict the acts of worship. Jesus shifts the focus to the *future* and also dissolves the tension between the *locations* of worship. Bultmann (1957:139-140; 1971:189) argues that this introduction of future worship is an indication that all the local cults will, in time to come, be stripped of their presumed importance. Furthermore, whereas the woman does not mention the *object* of the worship, Jesus does, and refers to the Father (ὁ πατήρ). The reference to *Father* could be significant here for the level of the characters, but I would rather argue that this is even more important on the level of the communication between author and reader, and thus postpone

discussion of this till we reach that stage. Nevertheless, this affords Jesus the opportunity to introduce the cognitive aspect of knowledge (whether true or false) in the present. With his reference to future worship, the character Jesus has created a sense of expectation, but he does not resolve the tension immediately by explaining fully what he means. He again refers to the present where the division between Jew and Samaritan can be ascribed to inadequate knowledge. The use of οἰδᾶω in the whole of the Gospel is a significant concept, but only as the reading progresses will the full implications of this concept in John's theology emerge more clearly (see Engelbrecht 1987). One can only state that at this stage in the narrative a vague inkling that this word is important in the whole scheme of things, begins to appear. (The same word was also used in the dialogue with Nicodemus.) A conclusion can only be reached as to the full significance of this concept when the reading of the whole Gospel is complete. For the purpose of this analysis, it is sufficient to mention that certain concepts like knowledge and so on are introduced or continued here, but the function, the total effect and ultimate theological import can only be determined later. It must be stressed, however, that this does not mean that only the occurrence of *words* must be analyzed; but also *contexts* where the issue is relevant. For instance, the ironies in this pericope where the woman clearly has inadequate knowledge about the identity of Jesus, his work and the significance of his words are also important in this regard (see also Silva 1983:27-28).

On the *level of the story*, it seems that the mention of πατήρ has given rise to the question about knowledgeable worship. The Jews know the Father and the Samaritans do not. Although worship and the full nature of worship becomes relevant here, this does not mean that it functions on the story level between the characters. Often the character level merely serves to introduce themes on a very superficial level, so that the author can communicate with his/her readers on a more substantial level. This seems to be the case here. On the character level, the characters are merely communicating on this superficial level, and there is nothing in the text that necessitates or compels one to suppose that the characters on their level are implying anything more.

Jesus continues and mentions in 4:22 that the salvation is ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. For a discussion on John's usage of 'Jews' which is used in a predominantly negative sense, see Schnackenburg (1965:469-470; 1968:435-436); Olsson (1974:197); O'Day (1986:69-70). 'Jews', in this context, is used merely as an indication of whence the salvation will come and does not coincide with the rather negative depiction of 'Jews' in the rest of the Gospel (see also Culpepper 1987:125-132 and Okure 1988:117). The salvation originates from the Jewish people in their capacity as God's people, but this does not exclude their rejection of Jesus.

The specific mentioning of 'the Jews' also serves another purpose. The woman is acutely aware of Jesus as Jew. By stating that the salvation is coming

from the Jews the cognitive possibility is created that Jesus the Jew can indeed be the bringer of salvation. If he is already a prophet, then it is a small step to identify him with the Messiah. The mention of the σωτηρία perhaps helps to set the scene for the term Messiah in 4:25. The figure of the Messiah was expected to be the bringer of salvation. The logical conclusion from the fact that the salvation is coming from the Jews, is that it will be brought about by the Messiah, and this necessitates his being Jewish.

In 4:23, the phrase ἐρχεται ὥρα is repeated as in 4:21, referring to the future. However, the addition of καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν immediately makes the situation described in 4:21f present. The same effect is achieved by the contrast between the woman's use of 'our fathers/you' (plural) in 4:20 which distances her and Jesus somewhat from the conflict (politeness principle). However, here in 4:22, Jesus moves this *past* conflict to the *present* by utilizing the much more immediate and personal 'you/we'. A new group of actants is also introduced here: the true worshipers (οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ) who replace the earlier groups of the Samaritans and Jews. O'Day (1986:71) observes that 4:23 is the starting point of a more discursive mode, since Jesus is here beginning to discard the established categories and to introduce his own. According to O'Day (1986:71), the different literary mode 'employed here helps to emphasize the shift from the ordinary present to the eschatological present.... The Samaritan woman, and through her the reader, is told in the most direct language of the dialogue to date that true worship, this new relationship with God as Father, is present *now*' [O'Day's italics].

The concept of 'worshiping in spirit and truth' (προσκυνεῖν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ) and the connection between this and the utterance πνεῦμα ὁ θεός have been discussed at length by Barrett (1978:237-239); Brown (1982,1:180-181); Olsson (1974:189-90); Schnackenburg (1965:471-472; 1968:439-440); Pazdan (1987:147); Dodd (1958:314-315), Okure (1988:115-116) and others. The theological meaning and exegesis of this utterance have been adequately examined by the above-mentioned exegetes. Since we are chiefly interested in determining how the language is used and functions, we do not deem it necessary to go into great depth on exegetical matters.

The *function* of these utterances in the conversation between the woman and Jesus is of course, in the first place, to try to get the woman to adopt a similar belief. Bach and Harnish (1979:41) in their taxonomy of communicative illocutionary acts states that the following illocutionary acts can be included under the class of constatives: assertives, predictives, retrodictives, descriptives, ascriptives, suggestives, informatives, confirmatives and so on. The function of *constatives* is formulated as expressing the speaker's belief (Bach & Harnish 1979:41). If one examines the utterances by Jesus made in 4:21-24, it is clear that the total illocutionary force of the utterances is exactly that. Verse 4:21 has a predictive force, 4:22 is assertive, 4:23 predictive and informative, and 4:24 assertive. The perlocutionary effect all these utterances is to get the woman to

adopt these same beliefs, but it also further serves to establish Jesus' position in her eyes. By referring to *future events*, he indicates that her assumption that he is a prophet is correct. However, in this instance, he indicates that he also has superior knowledge about God and God's plan. As a prophet he is able to know her past and aspects of the future. But his knowledge of God indicates that he is even bigger than that. The intended perlocution of all this is that the woman recognizes his true identity.

Jesus has now furnished the woman with enough information to recognize him, but, although she grasps much of what he has said, still does not realize what the *καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν* implicates. Her reply in 4:25 is in the affirmative — she as an individual now knows (*οἶδα*) certain things regarding the Messiah, but still expects him to come (*ὅταν ἔλθῃ*). Although it is clear that Jesus has provided her with everything the Messiah in her perception would do, she does not realize immediately that the time has now come and that the Christ is indeed speaking with her. The fact that the Samaritans did not use the title 'Messiah' (see Olsson 1974:191 and Okure 1988:121-127), is irrelevant here on the story level. The author is free to make his/her characters speak in the way that would suit his/her aim best). His words reminds her of what is to be expected of the Messiah, that is, to reveal all. On this she ponders a while, and her utterance in 4:25 has no intended perlocution. She is merely reflecting.

The character Jesus identifies himself with her words. He considers himself to be the revealer that reveals everything and intends the woman to recognize this. His intended perlocution fails in the sense that she does not recognize *him* as the revealer. Although his program introduced in 4:21-24, invokes in her the image of the expected revealer, she is unable to bridge the gap herself. To ensure that the conversation does not fail again, as it failed previously, the character Jesus abandons all indirect speech acts and veiled expressions and clearly and unequivocally states that he is the Messiah which she is still expecting. The question of his identity alluded to in the whole scene so far has now been resolved — clearly and openly, without any doubts. The evidence is clear before the woman. The utterance in the form of an assertive compels her to either accept it or reject it. She now has sufficient knowledge — clearly and without doubt. The perlocutionary effect on the woman is to induce her to take a stand — for or against Jesus. The author does not immediately continue her story and does not record any verbal response by her, and leaves the reader in the dark as to the success or failure of Jesus' intended perlocution up till 4:29. (For a full discussion on the *ἐγώ εἰμι* usage see Olsson 1974:192-193; O'Day 1986:72-74; Bultmann 1957:167; 1971:225; Harner 1970; Brown 1982,1:533-535; Kysar 1975:119-127; and Okure 1988:121).

The implied author/reader level also calls for attention. As was indicated above, 4:16 represents a major break or gap in the text — on both levels of the analysis. This sudden twist in the dialogue is also of great significance for the readers. On the story level, it has to do with the communication between the

characters and their interaction. However, on the level of the conversation between author and readers, matters are indeed of another nature. We have indicated earlier that the whole narrative calls to mind the betrothal type scene, but with significant changes. Up till this point in the narrative, although the first dialogue was not too successful, there was nothing in the text that suggested that this woman was married. For the readers expecting some similarity between the type-scene and Jesus' words this utterance would come as a complete surprise. Instead of a *maiden* the woman at the well is *married*. The author is advising his/her readers to consider the scene on a different level. It is as if he/she is throwing his/her readers off balance all the time. (If one considers that in a culture where documents were read aloud and where this document has its roots, then an oral reading of this dialogue would be even more effective. Unfortunately we cannot consider the possibilities of the oral nature of such narrative texts here. See also Dewey 1989:32-44 on oral methods of structuring texts. She uses Mark as an example).

The woman's reply in 4:17 continues this process of unbalancing the reader, for she answers as one would expect — that is, that she has no husband. One can perhaps also include this under reader 'victimization', to use Staley's (1986a:173) term, because the possibility arises that Jesus was in the wrong — again. It seems that the concept of reader victimization as Staley perceives it can and should be extended to include this 'wrong-footing' or manipulation of the readers. One can even go so far to postulate that it could be a so far unidentified literary device. The answer of Jesus which states that she has spoken the truth, again catches the reader unawares since it now contradicts his own statement in 4:16. The content of Jesus' utterance to the effect that instead of being an unmarried maiden, she is a woman of ill repute again brings some new disconcerting information. This exchange between Jesus and the woman is furthermore very disturbing to the reader, for where the author and readers have previously shared privileged knowledge which the woman does not have, here the situation is totally reversed. The woman and Jesus share privileged information which the readers do not have. The perlocutionary effect on the reader of this 'victimization' or 'unbalancing' or 'exploitation' or 'misleading' is to get the reader to suspend his/her very literal reading of the text and to cease to take the text merely at face value. He/she is made aware of the fact that everything is not as it seems, and this can open the way for a possible alternative way of interpreting the events. Whereas these verses (4:16ff) function as an integral part of the conversation on the story level and are mimetic of a real conversation, their function on this level is to invite the reader to a more careful reading of the text, where everything that is obvious is not so obvious, calling for a more careful reading. We have noted that the fact that the woman is actually living in sin and was, according to Jewish standards, leading an immoral life, is not exploited at all in the text, which seems rather strange. The fact that she is also well accepted by her own townsfolk contradicts the fact of a very immoral

or generally immoral life style. The absence of taking her immorality seriously on the story level can be indicative of the fact that the author is inviting the readers to another interpretation of this part of the dialogue. The fact that the distinction between the level of the story and the level of the author/reader must be strictly observed is very relevant here. While the story can continue, and does indeed continue in a very literal, logical and credible manner, the author can indicate to the readers that something completely different is signified by the conversation between the characters. This seems to be one of the main advantages of this methodology. The levels are distinguished and not intermingled as most interpreters seem to have done. They seldom distinguish the communication between author and reader and tend to use the *woman* as receptor of these clues and not the *reader*. The communication between the characters is actually much simpler, but is often happily mixed with considerations of authorial intent and readers' response (see, for instance, O'Day 1986:66-67 and Olsson 1974:186).

If one keeps the distinction of the levels in mind, it can help to differentiate between what the characters are doing on a character level and how their actions and words are used by the author to achieve some perlocutionary aim with the readers. As was indicated above, while the conversation between the characters develops along the expected lines and according to the rules, the reader can actually be victimized, and rules on the level of his/her interaction with the author violated. If one examines the actual reception of the text (see Bultmann 1957:138; 1971:188; Schnackenburg 1965:468; 1968:433; Brown 1982,1:171; Cahill 1982:41-48; Barrett 1978:335-336; Staley 1986a:181-182; Olsson 1974:186; Okure (1988:111-112) and the literature they refer to), it seems that from very early on the fact of the *five husbands* has drawn attention. While there is no doubting that on the *story level* it functions as something *literal*, it seems more than likely that the five husbands could refer to the practice of *Samaritan worship* (see Olsson 1974:186). Because of the clues presented to the reader in the immediately preceding verses, and because of the fact that the following discussion between Jesus and the woman centers around true and false worship, the five husbands could refer to the scandalous (in the eyes of the Jews) Samaritan practices, which were considered to be harlotry.

Carmichael (1980:342) sees the background for the whole scene in the Old Testament. He proposes that the whole narrative has marital overtones, as some Old Testament traditions have:

The evangelist feels comfortable in working with the notion of Jesus as a divine being who is involved in a love relationship with a woman because he can interpret precedents in the prophetic tradition of Hosea, Ezekiel and Jeremiah. When God tells Hosea to take a harlot as a wife it is for the purpose of acting out God's relationship with Israel. This identity of prophet and deity may well be served as the general model of the role of Jesus with the Samaritan woman.

Whether one agrees with Carmichael or not is not the issue here. The fact is that there is substantial support for the notion that the Samaritan religion and their relationship with God is the issue in the conversation here and not real husbands, as on the story level. If this fact is acknowledged, the rest of the conversation between the characters also makes good sense to the reader, in the sense that this *implicit* reference to the false worship of the Samaritans becomes *explicit* shortly after. The readers are primed by the author to see this.

The woman's utterance in 4:19 is of importance on two counts. *First*, the identity of Jesus as revealer is again touched upon and implicitly referred to. O'Day (1986:67) states regarding this aspect that 'Jesus' revelation of his knowledge of her true marital status leads the woman to declare him to be prophet (v. 19).... One could compare the woman's response to that of Nathanael in 1:47-51; from an unexpected demonstration of knowledge on Jesus' part comes a profession of Jesus' identity'.

Secondly, the woman's position with regard to the readers is also transformed by the words the author puts in her mouth. The woman is expressing a belief which the readers also share and have known from the beginning. Her character is aligned with the readers and can thus speak as one of them. When she asks her (indirect) question in 4:20, she asks a question with which the readers can also identify, and can also be of importance to them. That the whole scene focuses strongly on the question of the position of the Samaritans was already indicated in the repetitive use of the word *Samaritan*. Here the whole question of the relationship between Jesus and Samaritan is elevated from the sphere of cultural and social issues (4:9) to that of the *religious* — worship in fact. Whereas the author used irony and the woman's lack of knowledge in the previous section to enhance the readers understanding, here the woman's knowledge, discovery or insight transforms her to one of the 'insiders' and allows her to act as spokesman for the implied readers in asking a question on the correct place of worship.

Because of the fact that the woman is now closer to the readers, Jesus' emphatic and weighty *πίστευέ μοι, γύναι* is also a technique for focusing the attention of the readers on the importance of Jesus' utterances in 4:21-24. In this speech of Jesus, we find that there is twice a reference to the *future*, as opposed to the woman's reference to the *past*. This is very important for the communication between author and reader. The *author* and *readers* are far removed in time from Jesus and most probably are experiencing a situation similar to the one described in Jesus' words. By placing these words in Jesus' mouth, the author is implicating to his/her readers that this situation where worship is neither done on Gerizim or Jerusalem is not something unexpected. It is part and parcel of God's plan, and Jesus anticipates this. The temporal ordering which is found here can be a definite discourse strategy, aimed at achieving certain effects. The temporal switches in this section of the narrative are indeed of significance for the perlocution of the text. Schiffrin (1984:324)

states that 'temporal ordering has a role of transforming the audience from a passive recipient of information to a vicarious participant in an experience'.

This could also explain the rather strange use of the *plural* προσκυνήσετε in 4:21, where one would have expected the singular because of the very direct addressing of the woman in this verse. The implication could be that the *reference* here is not to the Samaritans as a group but to the *readers* with whom the woman is in agreement and a spokesman for. Again the intended perlocutionary effect of the utterances in 4:21-24 on the readers is in all probability much the same as that on the story level, with the exception that for the woman the situation is still in the future and for the readers it most probably has already become a reality. Also noteworthy is the prominent addition of the character Jesus to the woman's utterance. He adds the worship of '*the Father*'. At this stage in the reading process it is possible to look back in retrospect and establish that the concept of 'father' has been used over and over again. Throughout the dialogue, the woman has used this term for Jacob, in 4:12 and again in 4:20. The concept of 'father' is also implicitly present in the 'his son' of 4:5. The woman found her security in the concept of *her* ancestors, but this is now transcended by the reference to '*the Father*' which is repeated no less than three times here. There is a progression from Jacob as the father of the *one son Joseph*, to the 'fathers' of the *Samaritan people*, to God as Father of *all the believers*. Thus progress from a very narrow and limited view of the exclusivity of one group to the liberating discovery that God is the Father of all, who has no need of being worshipped in any one singular place. By placing these words in the mouth of Jesus the author is probably indicating to his/her readers that their implied situation is actually the required situation, and that it is in fact the continuation of a situation started in Samaria. The καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν is an indication of this. While Jesus' utterances have the illocutionary force of *predictives* and *assertives* on the story level, here on the level of the implied author/readers, the utterances have the illocutionary force of *confirmatives*. This is a very good example of how the language can be utilized to function differently on two levels, with the one complementing the other. Confirmatives are used when a speaker intends that the hearer to believe the claims the speaker is making, because some truth-seeking procedure forms the basis for the proposition (see Bach & Harnish 1979:42-43). But it must be noted that confirmatives belong to the class of illocutionary acts called 'constatives' (Bach & Harnish 1979:41). According to Bach and Harnish, a constative 'is the expression of a belief, together with the expression of an intention that the hearer form (or continue to hold) a like belief'. The perlocution on the level of the characters and that of the author/reader is virtually the same, with the exception that in the latter case it serves to legitimize an implied situation, by aligning it to God's plan and desire.

In 4:25, the woman uses words that a real Samaritan would probably not use, and these are clearly inserted for the sake of the readers. Whereas this

utterance functions on the story level to indicate yet another slight misunderstanding on her part, she is here expressing a belief on the nature of the revelation of Jesus. The author uses her to confirm to the readers the nature of Jesus' mission. Again her inadequate knowledge is used by the author to help the reader to enhance or confirm his/her knowledge of Jesus. O'Day (1986:72) contends that 4:25 is also an example of Johannine irony in the sense that the woman knows that the Messiah is coming, but the crucial insight in adding *ὁὐν ἐστὶν* to this is still missing. O'Day (1986:72) continues: 'Instead her words reflect the opposite perspective — *whenever (hotan)* that one comes.... The Samaritan woman's words ironically show that she is open to the words of the Messiah, but that she has not made the crucial step which will lead to her recognition and acceptance of Jesus and his revelation' [O'Day's italics]. This misunderstanding on her side compels the reader to make the correct deductions from the situation. The reader is induced to participate in the reading and interpreting of the text and the irony of the situation serves to confirm their beliefs as no ordinary declarative statement could achieve.

On the story level, one can perhaps regard Jesus' self-revelation in 4:26 as merely a statement of his identity, confirming that he is indeed the person or Messiah the woman refers to. However, the peculiar use of the *ἐγὼ εἰμι* phrase can communicate much more to the readers, who are well versed in the books of the Old Testament, where the same phrase is often used, but then *only by God*. Brown (1982,1:535-537) states that the absolute use of *ἐγὼ εἰμι* should be sought in the Old Testament and Palestinian Judaism. The same phrase is also used in Deutero-Isaiah. Here Jesus is made to speak in the same way in which Yahweh speaks. This is a very significant phrase from the viewpoint of the reader. So far Jesus' speeches and dialogues and actions have revealed something of his nature. The reader is well informed by the author about Jesus identity, but a bigger impact is created here when the main character of the story actually abandons and violates the *modesty maxim* and possibly the *tact maxim*. This brings the utterance to the attention of the readers with great effect. For the first time in the Gospel, Jesus in his *own words* and in the *first person* (see 4:10 where the third person is used) has stated something about himself. Now the ground has been prepared for the readers to accept the soon to follow *ἐγὼ εἰμι* utterances in the rest of the Gospel. The effect of this utterance on the readers is to explicitly confirm and strengthen their beliefs about the main character. Everybody, even the protagonist, have now expressed a belief about the character Jesus. O'Day (1986:73) also remarks that this involvement of the readers through irony is much more effective than any direct statement and continues to say that

it is for this reason that the *ego eimi* of v.26 has such tremendous impact on the reader. The distance which John has allowed throughout the dialogue for the woman's and the reader's free movement toward Jesus is removed with this absolute statement of self-

revelation. The reader is faced with a direct, definite revelation of Jesus that calls for a type of decision different from that of the ironic interplay of the rest of the dialogue. Now the decision is only to affirm or deny.

The chief effect of this utterance lies not in the fact that Jesus is identified as the Messiah, but in the character who does it. It is of great significance that Jesus did this himself, but so far as the reader is concerned it is not the ultimate revelation or climax of the story. The climax will only be reached once the Samaritan woman (or perhaps the Samaritans as a group) who is the object of the story and whom the reader feels is the one who must come to this knowledge, indeed expresses this belief. But so far, nowhere in the dialogue up to 4:26 is this belief expressed. The whole dialogue is centered around the identity of Jesus and the program directed against the woman to discover the stranger's identity. But this has not materialized, and the need for the story to continue is created. On the level of the readers the author has successfully communicated certain concepts to his/her readers, while at the story level the initial exchanges have not been too successful. By also not recording a response to or an acknowledgment of Jesus' self-revelation, the dialogue is left open and the reader has to anticipate a more satisfying end to the story.

(b) Brief summary of 4:16-26

The speech acts used in this section were chosen not only to logically continue the dialogue between the characters on the story level, but also to communicate certain fundamental truths through the story to the readers. On the *story level*, the sudden change in topic is intended to counter the woman's continued misunderstanding in a polite manner. The defensive attitude of the woman is reflected in her dropping of the vocative. Her denial that she has a husband is a counteraction intended to stop the character Jesus in his line of questioning. The utterance by Jesus in 4:17f reveals his omniscience, and further establishes his credibility and authority in her eyes. It seems that her unsavory past does not play a big part in the rest of the narrative on this level. Her acknowledgement of his being a prophet is an indication that the intended perlocution of 4:18 was realized. The step to the question (in the form of a statement) on worship is also a logical step because of the felicity conditions created by the speech acts from 4:16 onwards. The question by the woman reflects her total acceptance of Jesus as an authority on religious matters.

The utterances in the words of Jesus in 4:21-24 also reflects the position of Jesus. The use of predictives necessitates his being in a position to do just that. Furthermore, his superior knowledge about the future, about worship and the requirements of God confirms his position even more. These utterances are also carefully structured so that the woman is not affronted by the negative depiction of Samaritan worship. The woman accepts these utterances and their revelatory

nature reminds her of the ultimate revelation that can be expected from the Messiah. She expresses this in the form of a statement, but without any apparent perlocution. It is as if she is musing or reflecting on the *modus operandi* of the Messiah. Her train of thought is interrupted by Jesus who openly declares in the first person that he is the long-awaited Messiah. No immediate response by the character of the woman is recorded.

For the *readers*, the utterance by Jesus in 4:16 also represents an abrupt switch from the preceding half of the dialogue. The intertext of the betrothal is again exploited with great effect. The situation at the well requires a female that can be married. Jesus' words shatters this expectation when he asks her to call her husband. Her answer on the other hand confirms the expectation of the well scene. The problem of the readers is even more intensified when Jesus states in 4:17b that the woman indeed spoke the truth, and that she does not have a husband. The readers are conditioned by all this not to take any utterance merely at face value, something which the rest of Jesus' utterances clearly indicates. The number of the woman's previous husbands is given as five, and the perceptive reader is to detect another intertext here in the imagery of marriage, immoral life and so on. The allusion can possibly be to other Old Testament instances where the relationship towards God is expressed in these terms. The implication is that the woman's moral life, as representative of the Samaritans, is also indicative of the quality of the worship of the Samaritans. This is confirmed by the fact that the topic of Samaritan worship is indeed introduced in the very next verse. The utterance of the woman in 4:19 serves to align her with the readers who are also of the opinion that Jesus is a prophet. Her question (in the form of a statement) in 4:20 can express the question anticipated by the implied author to have relevance for the implied readers and the woman is acting as spokeswoman for them. Jesus' answer in 4:21-24 in which there are a number of temporal switches, identification and alignment of groups, and the introduction of the 'Father' and what he expects of true worship is also an answer for the sake of the readers. Their specific situation is shown to be directly linked to the will of God, and the predictions of Jesus. The fact that worship can also be expected to not having links with any specific place, is strongly addressed here in the form of constatives (confirmatives), and finally a directive (requirement) in 4:24.

The utterance by the woman, which has no real perlocution on the story level, serves on this level to induce the readers to participate again, in the sense that her slow reaction and putative stance afford the readers the chance to correct the character and to formulate the correct conclusion that this Jesus is indeed the Messiah she is referring to. The words of Jesus confirm this identity very strongly, especially since this self-revelatory utterance is in the form of utterances usually ascribed to God. Again there is the implicit referral to an intertext.

The fact that no immediate reaction on the woman's side is recorded, keeps the attention of the readers since a satisfactory ending to this saga has not yet been reached, and the reaction of the woman or Samaritans must still be awaited.

The speech acts employed in this specific exchange are as follows:

v 16: Λέγει αὐτῇ, Ὑπαγε φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε.

form: imperative

type of illocution: directive (requirement)

perlocution: The character of the woman is asked to desist in her current line of conversation, and to consider a new topic. The readers are also to follow the new topic introduced. They are also to recall the intertext, and transgression of the expected is to make them feel unease and apprehension.

v 17a: ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (retractive)

perlocution: The woman in denying having a husband, intends to get Jesus to stop his threatening line of questioning. For the readers the intertext is again overruled, and the resultant unease is to indicate that everything is not as it seems.

v 17b: λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Καλῶς εἶπες ὅτι Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: Jesus, by granting that she is speaking the truth, intends the woman to feel less threatened, and to make her more susceptible to his next utterance. The readers are still being made uneasy by the constant shattering of expectations.

v 18a: πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες, καὶ νῦν δὲ ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν σου ἀνὴρ· τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (informative)

perlocution: Jesus, by revealing the woman's past, intends her to understand that he is more than just an ordinary man. The

readers are reassured by this, because the unease is to an extent resolved, when the strangeness of the conversation so far is clarified.

v 18b: τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶρηκας.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: Jesus does not want the woman to feel threatened because of his revelation, and reassures her again. It seems that there is no clear intended perlocution on the level of author/reader other than what was stated in 17b.

v 19: λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, Κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: In reaching the conclusion that Jesus is a prophet, the woman establishes the position of Jesus, and indicates that she accepts his intended perlocution from 4:18b. The utterance of the woman also serves to reassure the readers about the identity of Jesus, and thus align the readers with her.

v 20: οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ.

form: statement

type of illocution: directive (question)

perlocution: By contrasting the practice of Jewish and Samaritan worship, the woman is requesting information on the validity of the two views. The readers are to feel that the woman is speaking and expressing a question which is in their minds.

v 21a: λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πίστενέ μοι, γύναι...

form: imperative

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: Jesus is assuring the woman that although his next utterance may be problematic, it is worth accepting. The possible intended perlocution on the level of the implied readers is much the same.

v 21b: ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρὶ.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (predictive)

perlocution: Jesus intends the woman to see the interim nature of current religious practices. The readers are to feel reassured that their situation was predicted and foreseen long ago by Jesus.

v 22: ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: By contrasting Jewish and Samaritan knowledge, and by confirming that salvation is from the Jews, Jesus as a Jewish prophet intends the woman to accept that his interpretation regarding worship is acceptable. The readers are also to be convinced that Jesus has the correct knowledge regarding the topic under discussion.

v 23: ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα, καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (predictive)

perlocution: Jesus, in predicting and announcing that the situation of true worship is now already possible, wants the woman to adopt this way of worshipping, and act accordingly, also because it is the will of God. The readers are to be confirmed in their beliefs that this is indeed the way in which worship is destined to take place, because it is the will of God.

v 24a: πνεῦμα ὁ θεός,

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: In asserting something about the nature of God, Jesus wants to convince the woman that his interpretation in 4:23 is logical and correct. The illocutionary force is also intended to get the readers to accept this.

v 24b: καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.

form: statement

type of illocution: directive (requirement)

perlocution: In prescribing the way of worship the character Jesus intends that the woman should adopt this behavior. The readers are advised to continue worshipping in this way.

v 25: λέγει αὐτῇ ἡ γυνή, Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (suggestive)

perlocution: The woman is just musing, with no intended perlocution. The intended perlocution on the level of the readers is that they become more involved in the narrative by formulating the correct stance towards the character Jesus. Their own formulation of this will strengthen their own beliefs strongly.

v 26: λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The character Jesus intends that the woman should recognize him as the Messiah and become a believer. The utterance reaffirms the beliefs of the readers that Jesus is indeed the divine Messiah by utilizing the Ἐγώ εἰμι form usually ascribed to God. The omission of any reaction on the woman's side keeps the interest of the readers and induces them to continue reading.

2.6 The story continues

This section can be divided into three coherent subsections. First, the verses 4:27-30 are clearly transitional, and two incidents are referred to — the arrival of the disciples who hesitate to ask a question, and the departure of the woman who leaves to speak with the townspeople. These two incidents are treated in this order in 4:31-38 and 4:39-40. Both 4:27 and 4:31 are introduced by temporal indications (Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ and Ἐν τῷ μεταξύ) while the particle (δὲ) and the reintroduction of both the people and the woman are indicators that 4:39 takes up a theme which 4:27-30 has only introduced briefly. Theoretically this transitional section also functions as a link between the

previous dialogue and the final two scenes in the story. The dialogue with the woman introduces in the first instance, the whole question of ὕδωρ ζῶν, a nourishment whether physical or spiritual. The same theme of physical/spiritual nourishment is introduced in the dialogue with the disciples. In the second instance, the dialogue with the woman also introduces the theme of the identity of Jesus, and this is reflected in the scene where the Samaritan villagers are the actants.

2.6.1 4:27 - 30: Transition: The disciples return and the woman departs

Text:

27 Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναῖκός ἐλάλει· οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπεν, Τί ζητεῖς; ἢ, Τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς; 28 ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὕδριάν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, 29 Δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα· μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; 30 ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν.

The author takes up the narration again and reintroduces the character of the disciples. There has been much comment on the fact that they were astonished that Jesus was talking to a woman. The explanation usually offered for this astonishment is that it was not customary for a *Rabbi* to converse with females (see Pirque Aboth 1:5, Babilonian Talmud 536, Brown 1982,1:173, Barrett 1978:240, Morris 1981:274 and Okure 1988:133-134). This explanation offers no real problems as the situation and context would dictate this kind of behavior for the characters, and the disciples have so far experienced Jesus as a *conventional* Rabbi. And as a conventional Rabbi, his conversing with a woman would indeed present some problems, especially if it was in public. Jesus' behavior is again depicted as contrary to the current customs, since even his disciples find it strange. The intended perlocution of this utterance is to get the readers involved, by forcing them to evaluate Jesus' actions in terms of the reactions of the disciples. Is Jesus so wrong, or are the disciples not fully informed? The following utterance will indicate that the latter is the case, when the disciples are shown in a somewhat more negative light.

Also on the level of the communication between the implied author and reader, the way in which the woman is depicted is significant. In the preceding verses, we have noticed that the author exercised care to add the qualification *Samaritan* when speaking about either the woman or the group she belongs to. Here the qualification which seemed so important earlier on, is markedly absent. The author has violated the rule of *clarity* which he/she himself/herself has taken care to introduce, and the readers are again called upon to engage in conversation with the author and try to establish the reason for his/her deviation from the previously set pattern. An explanation for this can be that the author is continuing to confirm the situation which has developed in the

course of the conversation between Jesus and the woman, that is, that the differences between *Jew* and *Samaritan* are not of significant any more, because these issues will become redundant in the light of the true worship. For the sake of the *reader*, the differences between Jew and Samaritan are played down so that the perceptions so far developed are presented as still valid, and the author takes care not to disturb the readers' thoughts by again allowing a character or set of characters to refer to the schism. (The reference to their being amazed at his conversing with a woman can of course also be a starting point to introduce females and Jesus' relationship with females other than his mother into the narrative, but this will only be determined by a full reading of the Gospel. This could then be a way of creating an expectation within the reader that this is an issue which in some way will be addressed later in the text). On the *level of the characters*, the report that they were amazed is also a way of depicting their real lack of understanding of Jesus. It clearly shows that they as a group do not possess the same amount of knowledge as the readers and other characters. They are being categorized as 'outsiders' with regard to what happened there, and their inadequate knowledge, like that of the woman, gives Jesus the opportunity to elaborate on a specific theme.

In 4:27b, the question regarding the disciples' failure to ask the questions in their minds, is explained by most commentators as a sign of reverence towards their master (see Morris 1981:274, Schnackenburg 1965:477; 1968:443). The rules of conversation implied by the context, and what is known of the relationship between Jesus and the disciples constitute a perfectly acceptable explanation on the story level. However, this does not explain why the author considered it necessary to describe something which did not take place. If it did not happen, then why refer to it? In speech act terms, the author has violated the *economy principle* by giving information which is not necessary to understand the utterances that follow, nor expressed it in terms which make it as short as possible. So while an explanation on the story level is easily acceptable, the *reader* still has to make sense of the utterance which actually violates the economy principle, and must calculate why the author reported these questions which were not asked, but which are ascribed to the disciples as a group. There are a number of possibilities as to the illocutionary force here. *First*, the disciples as a group could be being contrasted with the woman. They are amazed and perplexed and do not ask a question of Jesus, whereas the woman indeed asks questions and challenges the words and actions of Jesus. Alternatively, by not asking, the disciples could be implicating that they wish to disregard or ignore this strange behavior of their master (Okure 1988:135). This would also be in contrast with the woman's behavior. *Secondly*, the aim could be to describe the status of Jesus, as seen by the disciples. *Thirdly*, the focus could be on the content of the questions — that is the quest/need of the woman and the speaking /revelation of Jesus. If one accepts the *first* possibility, the perlocutionary effect on the readers would be that of calling upon them to

decide which of the actions (of the woman or alternatively of the disciples) is most acceptable and recommendable. If the *second* interpretation is followed, the perlocution of the utterance could be to enhance the position of Jesus further. If even the disciples were reluctant to question his actions, then it indeed indicates his extremely high position. If the *third* option is considered, the perlocution could be to clarify for the readers the issues at hand. By posing questions which have been answered in the preceding verses, the readers are offered the chance to answer these for themselves and to obtain a clear view of the central issues. O'Day (1986:75) comes close to the third option when she argues that 'the ultimate irony of these questions, which highlights the disciples' ignorance and disengagement, is that the reader can answer both questions on both levels. For the moment, the reader is more involved with Jesus' revelation than his disciples are'.

Whichever option one prefers, the fact remains that the author is communicating something about the relationship between the disciples and Jesus to the readers, and that this relationship is indicative of an action or attitude which the author intends the readers to follow or adopt. The author does this by using the language in this specific manner, and allowing the characters not to voice their doubts. As to the intended perlocution, it remains the task of the interpreter to establish this facet. For us the third option seems to be the most probable one, but the others need not be discarded. Another possibility could be that one or more of the options are simultaneously applicable.

Having described the arrival of the disciples, the author turns to the simultaneous departure of the woman in 4:28. Her departure to the nearby city is preceded by the utterance ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς. Morris (1981:275) quotes a number of possible explanations for her leaving the ὑδρίαν which include the explanation that she left the jar for Jesus to use, that this contrasts her behavior with that of the disciples, that she could practically move faster without the jar on her head, and that since she had not filled it, she left it there in order to avoid from carrying it back and forth. O'Day (1986:75) contends that the function of this verse is to indicate that 'the character who is moving off-stage is not disappearing forever. Both details [*disciples' departure 4:8 and this verse JEB*] prepare the readers for the character's return'.

All the above explanations of this utterance center around a practical explanation of this utterance. These explanations may historically speaking, or empirically, be acceptable if real actions were being described in detail. The fact remains however, that the author has selected and chosen to describe these actions in detail and not all the other actions at the well prior to her departure; details such as the question of whether the woman was sitting or standing and so on. Furthermore, the fact that this utterance is conspicuous, is clear from all the comments made because of it. The first question that must be answered is why this utterance is so conspicuous. It is so striking because of the fact that the

woman, who had not responded at all to Jesus' self-revelation is the subject here. The rules of the conversation dictate that she responds to Jesus, and if she does not, this would constitute a breaking of the politeness principle. As far as the readers are concerned, she did not, and here in 4:28 her only response to Jesus is in fact recorded, but her response is not verbal as it could be expected, but is described as an *action*. Her response is, therefore, striking because it does not constitute a verbal answer and because it also constitutes behavior which could be considered unacceptable. This is on the story level.

On the level of the author and reader one finds that the textual rhetoric principles of both clarity and relevance are being violated by the author in the sense that he/she is suddenly describing in *minute detail* something of which the relevance and meaning are not clear from the immediate context. The woman and Jesus left the literal meaning of *water* since 4:14 and have continued to discuss other topics. Also, the arrival and discussion of the disciples have been described previously and suddenly the author is reporting such a small detail as the fact that the woman left her vessel. The author is clearly signalling to his/her readers that his/her violation of the rules has some significance. Even more so since it is the first reaction by the woman that is recorded after Jesus' self-revelation, moreover, it is significant that she is recorded doing something which could seem strange in the context of the whole described situation and in the light of socio-cultural practices, that is, leaving her (possibly) valuable water vessel lying about. Nevertheless, all the above together account for the conspicuousness of this utterance.

The question now arises as to whether the author is signalling that the reader must infer something from this description or not. If he/she is merely being informative, then it is very strange that this fact is mentioned in isolation and not others as well. If the author is, however, signalling that something else is being communicated by this purely informative utterance, then it must be interpreted thus. We contend that the latter case is applicable here and that the author is in fact signalling something about the reaction of the woman to the readers. Furthermore, it seems obvious that if the author is not intending a purely literal reading, then a non-literal reading of the text may be applicable (see Terblanche 1987:129; Fraser 1984:33; and the critique on this view by Levinson 1983:270-276).

The woman's response to Jesus is to leave her water jar behind. In the light of the above this could mean that she is now in possession of the real living water. This indicates that the words of Jesus in 4:14 have become a reality — she has at last understood that not real water was the issue, but spiritual water, which cannot be transported by means of any vessel. This, taken together with the fact that she departs to the town and starts speaking with the people there, indicates that this interpretation is at least probable. Especially so if the fact that the subject of 'harvesting' is an issue in the following verses. This reading of the text is also followed to some extent by Boers (1988:183) who argues that

'in so far as the jar represents the means of satisfying the need for drinking water, dropping it must mean the negation of that need'.

This means that the author is indicating that the woman understands the words of Jesus. It also explains why she is eager to leave for the town to witness to the people. She, in fact, *says* to them (λέγει) and does not *ask*, as the sentence form could imply: μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; Her utterance in 4:29 is noteworthy for a number of reasons. The imperative form used in the beginning of the sentence must be taken as a not-binding directive (see Terblanche 1987:135), since she is not in a position to command the villagers, nor is there anything in the context that suggests that this is the case. She is thus *requesting* them to undertake a certain action, or she is *inviting* them to do something. Although the verb is in the *imperative* it has the illocutionary force of a *requestive*. Boers (1988:183-184) adds that it is her enthusiasm that inspires the villagers to come to Jesus. The perlocution of the utterance is obvious, that is, she intends them to go to Jesus to see for themselves. The woman substantiates her request by referring to what Jesus has done. Her whole utterance is formulated in such a way that the villagers are not overwhelmed by it or made incredulous by the extreme nature of the content of the utterance. She is careful not to give so much information that the villagers would reject her words out of hand, even if it were true. The principle of processibility (Leech 1983:64) is clearly applicable here. This states that 'the text should be presented in a manner which makes it easy for the hearer to decode in time... thus in encoding we are often presented with choices as to (a) how to segment the message into units; (b) how to assign degrees of prominence or subordination to different parts of the message; and (c) how to order parts of the message'.

In this regard, the *end-focus maxim* is also important here. Clark and Clark (1977:548) postulate that this is a universal or near-universal of language. The result of the application of this maxim is that the segmentation or ordering of a complex utterance is usually done in such a way that it serves the *end-focus maxim*, that is, it ensures that the more complex or problematic or important constituents of an utterance are placed at the end. This explains the structuring of the utterance of the woman. She proceeds from a simple request to a neutral depiction of Jesus as man, and describes his actions not as those of the Messiah who reveals everything (ἅπαντα), but of only revealing everything she has done (πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα). The content of her utterance becomes more complex, but she can hardly attribute to this man (ἄνθρωπον) the attributes of the Messiah, and therefore she only refers to everything that she has done, which is *tellable* enough at this stage (Pratt 1977:132-151). The processibility of her utterance is, therefore, assured as the villagers are led through stages to accept it. The last part of her utterance has the grammatical form of an interrogative, and a rather weak one at that, and although it is not a *denial*, it is also not a strong *affirmative*. The interrogative is used here with the illocutionary force of

a *suppositive*. Suppositives include, according to Bach and Harnish (1979:44), the following, where *e* = expression, *P* = presumption, *S* = speaker, *H* = hearer. For the sake of clarity we give the whole schema presented by Bach and Harnish (1979:44):

Suppositives: (assume, hypothesize, postulate, stipulate, suppose, theorize)

In uttering *e*, *S* supposes that *P* if *S* expresses:

- i. the belief that it is worth considering the consequences of *P*, and
- ii. the intention that *H* believe [*sic*] that it is worth considering the consequences of *P*.

The most important point of the woman's utterance, and the most incredible part was saved for last, in correspondence with the *end-focus maxim*. The perlocutionary force of this utterance is to get the villagers to investigate her utterance and to validate it for themselves. It is formulated in such a careful way, because the implication of the utterance is hard to believe. The woman does not want to preclude their participation by overwhelming them with unprocessable information. That the intended perlocution has become a real perlocution is clear from their reaction — they start going out of the town to see for themselves. On the level of the author/reader communication, the effect of this description of the woman's activities is again to heighten the suspense. By leaving her water jar behind it is possibly hinted that she has indeed grasped what Jesus said, but although the clues could also be taken to mean that this was the case, they are not overt enough to compel the readers to accept that she has accepted Jesus' self-revelation. The fact that she also does not verbally respond to Jesus, served to create tension within the readers — will she or will she not? Her careful and non-committal conversation with the villagers does not answer the question in the minds of the readers. They are sure something is going on, but the extent of the actions is still not clear. The author continues to keep the readers in the dark, and the suspense is made even more acute by inserting yet another scene before the resolution of the dilemma of the readers, who at this stage are still in dire need of seeing exactly how the woman will react to Jesus' utterances.

2.6.2 Brief summary of 4:27-30

This transitional section is clearly aimed at the readers. The arrival of the disciples and their wonder at the fact that Jesus is conversing with the woman confirm their position as orthodox characters and contrast sharply with the somewhat unorthodox actions of Jesus. The fact that they also do not voice their doubts aloud could indicate their esteem of Jesus, but it is more probably designed to align Jesus and the readers closely with each other, while the disciples are cast as outsiders. This facilitates the formulation by the readers of exactly what is going on, for in order to 'criticize' the disciples, they are

compelled to obtain a clear picture for themselves. They have to answer the questions not asked by the disciples, and this is nothing but an interpretation of the dialogue with the woman. The speech acts thus employed are a powerful way of involving readers and communicating certain truths.

By describing the departure of the woman in terms of her leaving the *ὄδρῳ* behind, the author is implicating that she in fact understood Jesus correctly. This is implicated to the readers by means of speech acts which violate the expected. If the author is indeed implicating this, it is done in a very veiled or covert way, which still leaves the possibility open that the readers could be mistaken. Finality on the exact position of the woman has so far not been reached and must await further confirmation.

In a similar fashion her calling of the villagers is constructed in such a manner that while the villagers react positively on the story level, the readers are still none the surer about her position, or theirs.

Tension is also created by the last utterance stating that the Samaritans are coming out of the village. Well aware of the traditional enmity between Jews and Samaritans, the readers do not know exactly what to expect. The insertion of the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples further delays the action and increases the tension. However, the author is also very careful in his/her implementation of the language not to advance the schism between Jews and Samaritans. This is done by omitting the by now customary adjective 'Samaritan' when referring to both the woman and the townspeople.

The speech acts used in this section are:

v 27a: Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει·

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (descriptive)

perlocution: The readers are expected to perceive that Jesus is still acting contrary to the expected pattern of behavior, and are induced to evaluate this strange situation.

v 27b: οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπεν, Τί ζητεῖς; ἢ Τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς;

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The disciples are shown in a negative light and the intended perlocution is to align the readers with Jesus as insiders against the disciples as outsiders. The readers are also forced to formulate the answers to the disciples' questions, and this affirms something about the correct interpretation of Jesus' dialogue with the woman in their minds.

v 28: ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (descriptive)

perlocution: The veiled indication of the woman's reaction towards Jesus' self-revelation communicates to the readers that she is perhaps reacting positively, but there is still room for doubt. The effect is that the readers' *attentio* is assured.

v 29a: Δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα·

form: imperative

type of illocution: directive (requestive)

perlocution: The urging of the woman is intended to induce the townspeople to investigate this man for themselves. On the level of the implied reader/author, the woman's words merely indicate that she is reacting on account of what Jesus said, but exactly what this implies, and if she understood him correctly is not stated at all. The effect is much the same as that of the previous utterance.

v 29b: μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός;

form: question

type of illocution: constative (suppositive)

perlocution: The character of the woman is careful not to state the incredible outright. She uses the form of a question to express a possibility. This suppositive strengthens the perlocution of the previous utterance in that it provides further incentive for the villagers to act in the required manner. On the level of the implied readers the intended effect is much the same as in the previous two utterances.

v 30: ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (informative)

perlocution: By indicating that the people are coming out of the village towards Jesus, a degree of tension is created, which ensures reader involvement and interest.

2.6.3 4:31 - 38: 'Meanwhile'

Text:

31 Ἐν τῷ μεταξύ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες, Ῥαββί, φάγε. 32 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγὼ βρώσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε. 33 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Μὴ τις ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν; 34 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐμὸν βρώμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελεώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον. 35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμός ἐρχεται; ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν. ἤδη 36 ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων. 37 ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὅτι Ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων. 38 ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.

Commentators have commented at length on Ἐν τῷ μεταξύ in 4:31 (see Barrett 1978:240, Bultmann 1957:143; 1971:194; Morris 1981:75, for instance), and usually depict it as a rather uncommon adverbial usage of μεταξύ. However, the whole phrase must be seen as an *idiom*, used for the concept of 'meanwhile', that is, an 'extent of time within another unit or extension of time' (Louw & Nida 1988,1:647). This categorizes the whole of the conversation with the disciples in 4:31-38, and not just the immediately following utterances.

Regarding this adverbial phrase, Okure (1988:137-138) states that it 'looks backwards to vv 28-30 and forwards to v 39, it gives vv 31-38 the appearance of an insertion calculated to fill up the time of waiting for the arrival of the Samaritans'.

On the story level, the disciples do exactly what they are supposed to do. They go to buy food and prepare it, and then request Jesus to eat in 4:31. These verses together with 1:37-51, 6:66-71 and the farewell discourses are the only private discussions between the disciples and Jesus in the Gospel. The dialogue begins with an imperative, as did 4:7 where the conversation with the woman started. There are quite a number of remarkable similarities between the dialogues with the woman and the disciples. We will shortly point these out as the discussion develops. The only other instance in the text where a conversation is initiated (4:29), also starts with an imperative.

Here the disciples beseech Jesus to eat. That this utterance is a request and not a command flows naturally from the context: the fact that they use the word 'Rabbi', and the quotation formula where ἡρώτων is used. On this level, it is the usual form of address used for Jesus. The disciples used it in 1:38,49 as did Nicodemus in 3:2. Of significance here is the fact that John the Baptist is also called Rabbi in 3:26, which is the customary form of address for religious

leaders. Olsson (1974:221) concludes from this that 'in our text the title *Rabbi* probably marks a teaching and revelation situation'.

Contrary to this view, it must be stressed that there is nothing in the text that suggests this possibility — no rules were violated, nothing is in contrast with the context and situation; as can be expected, there are no clues or indication that something else is being implicated, and the utterance makes good sense as it is. Seen from a speech act perspective, there is nothing that supports Olsson's position.

Just as the issue of real water was waived by Jesus in the first dialogue with the woman, so he brushes aside the offer of the disciples in 4:32, by emphatically stating that he has access to other food, just as he stresses the fact of his being able to give the woman alternative water (ὕδωρ ζῶν). The whole question of *knowledge* is also raised again. Jesus knows certain things which the woman does not know and he also knows certain things which the disciples do not. In the discussion with the woman, the reaction to Jesus' claim to have access to the living water was an incredulous question (introduced by μή). Here we find a similar structure. He claims to have access to other food and the disciples ask an incredulous question introduced by μή. On both occasions, it is clear that the people who converse with Jesus misunderstand his meaning and take it literally. These misunderstandings offer Jesus the chance to elaborate on the misunderstood item (see Boers 1988:186-187). Olsson (1974:223) and O'Day (1986:78-79) are right in remarking that we also have an instance of Johannine irony here. In speech act terms, Jesus' abrupt answer in 4:32 can be seen as having the intended perlocution of inducing the disciples to stop thinking of natural nourishment and concentrate on something else. He is actually inviting them to speculate on the nature of the food which he claims to have access to.

This intended perlocution is not realized, for in 4:33 they respond not by questioning the *nature* of this food, but asking about the *source* of the food which they still view as similar to the food they brought, exactly as the woman did. They again do not respond directly to Jesus, but to each other, verbalizing a question but not asking it, now in *contrast* with the way the woman acted. She asked questions if something bothered her. Their perplexity and unwillingness to approach Jesus directly, vividly illustrate the words of Jesus to the effect that *they* also do not have sufficient knowledge. As a group, they are not pictured very favorably here — slow to ask questions and clearly misunderstanding Jesus. They are distanced from Jesus while the readers are actually closer to Jesus. O'Day (1986:79) remarks that 'the reader is able to understand *both* what Jesus says *and* what he means. For the moment the reader, as a result of his or her participation in the revelatory dynamics of the narrative, stands closer to Jesus' revelation than the disciples do' [O'Day's italics]. It does indeed seem that the disciples are being victimized for the effect that this would have on readers. It

is clear that both the Samaritan woman and the disciples have to go through an *Erkenntnisprozess* (Leidig 1979:152) and that these verses serve this revelatory purpose in the story (see also Okure 1988:138, Olsson 1974:238-239).

On the level of the author/reader, the exchange between Jesus and the disciples clearly recalls for the readers the dialogue with the woman. Not only is there a similar *formal structure*, but also *irony* and *misunderstanding*. The disciples act according to that what can be expected in their offering of food. Jesus reacts rather strangely and violates the politeness principle (Leech 1983:132-139), and especially the maxim of agreement, by not even accepting their offer or trying to mitigate the disagreement between them. Clearly the author is *flouting* this maxim in order to communicate something to the readers — the author is *flouting* while the character is *violating*. The character Jesus emphatically distances himself from them by using the emphatic ἐγὼ and ὑμεῖς, and further complicates the issue by referring to their inadequate knowledge. Very strange behavior indeed for a teacher to his pupils, who left everything to follow him, as the previous three chapters indicated.

All this, together with the perplexed reply by the disciples can indicate to the readers who immediately grasp the disciples' dilemma, that Jesus is not referring to natural food but something else. O'Day (1986:134) incorrectly criticizes Olsson for postulating that the informed reader can supply the answer to the questions put by the disciples, although they even put the questions incorrectly. Because the reader has witnessed the scene at the well and very clearly understands that Jesus cannot possibly be referring to real bread, and because of the violation of the quality maxim (Jesus obviously states something that is not true) they have to assume that the reference is not to real food but that a non-literal interpretation is necessary. From there it is but a small step to calculating that Jesus' conversation with the woman has something to do with this *food*. This increases the irony since they actually saw the person who provided Jesus with his nourishment! (See also Boers 1988:188.) By giving the readers a chance to evaluate the disciples' response, the irony of their response and the chance to fill in and interpret Jesus' words for themselves, the author has again involved the readers in the story in a way a normal assertive utterance would not have made possible.

The use of irony has a singular effect here. The fact that the readers again get the feeling of being 'insiders' together with Jesus, is advantageous in the way we indicated above (see 4:9-15). Sidgwick (1907:499), quoted by O'Day (1986:30-31), describes the effect of irony thus:

The object of the highest expression is not to *represent* a fact or feeling to a passive percipient... but to make him really *see*, by stimulating his imagination. If you wish to produce the effect, you cannot do it by mere word; you must get the hearer's imagination

to help. And thus it often comes about that while the lower stages of feeling can be expressed, the higher stages must be suggested. In the ascent the full truth will do; but the climax can only be reached by irony. [O'Day's italics]

The fact that the readers can arrive at the answer before Jesus gives it in 4:34, has the effect on the readers to feel very strongly about the calculations they have made and it makes them much more receptive of the crucial statements the author is going to make via Jesus' words in 4:34-38. The author uses the disciples and their misunderstanding to prepare fertile ground with the readers and to ensure that the message about to be revealed, is received as well as possible. The strategy is much the same as that used in the first part of the dialogue with the woman. In 4:9-15 the implied author prepares the readers first and then communicates the essence of the message in 4:16-26. Here we also find that the communication between Jesus and the disciples has failed somewhat. Jesus was rude to them, and they failed to understand the message. However, the failure of the disciples was the readers' gain, and the author can now continue to divulge important information to the readers.

Verses 4:34-38 have presented interpreters with considerable difficulties through the years. Olsson (1974:223) also expresses serious problems with this text: 'This speech, vv. 34-38, is one of the most obscure texts in Jn.... In order to interpret the text, "the literary critics" have gone to very great lengths as regards dividing it up into various independent fragments. Commentators often fix on certain parts of the text, assigning them a meaning in a context which they themselves make up from ideas on how the text came into existence.' Carmichael (1980:344) states that the verses recall *the creation*, for 'the implied transformation of the Samaritans into new beings the evangelist employs the language of sowing and harvesting'. Brown (1982,1:173-175, 181-184) and Schnackenburg (1965:480-488; 1968:446-455) both give conflicting interpretations of the scene.

The above are just a few illustrative examples of the difficult and divergent interpretations supplied for these few verses. Again it does indeed seem possible that the difficulties arise because the two levels of communication are not fully taken into consideration. The author is narrating a story and, therefore, the *story* must have a logical and understandable content, but through all this the author is using the language, images and characters to create a message for *readers*, and the two levels should not be confused. The communication on *the story level* can be utilized by the author who knows his/her readers are reading from the post-resurrectional viewpoint and would, therefore, interpret the narrative much more richly than the actual story level presupposes. But to assign to the character Jesus all the possible implications that implied readers can be expected to make, is to blend the two levels irresponsibly.

On the story level, Jesus has just, to the perplexity of the disciples, mentioned that he has other food that they do not know about. They ask questions about this, although not directly to Jesus, but he continues to explain what he meant by it. The context makes it clear that they cannot have the faintest idea what kind of food he is talking about, and the fact that their questions are about the *source* of the food and not the *nature* of the food necessitates an explanation, which the character Jesus gives in 4:34-38. He clarifies the nature of this mysterious food and indicates that he used the terms βρῶμά / βρῶσις metaphorically. This indication that βρῶμά is used metaphorically is further supported by the fact that Jesus switches between the terms: from βρῶσις to βρῶμά. By changing to another word for the same meaning a subtle indication is given that there is also a change in the reference. At this stage, it is not clear to the disciples what exactly doing God's will and fulfilling his work refer to. This violation of the clarity principle necessitates a fuller explanation and the character Jesus indeed provides this in his subsequent explanation.

Important to note is that during the whole of Jesus' dialogue with the woman the question of the division between Jews and Samaritans featured strongly in his communication of the essence of his message to her. Here in the parallel to 4:16-26, however, this aspect is deliberately played down in the discussion with his disciples. The fact that the division between Samaritan and Jew is suspended in this part of the narrative has already been noted in the failure to continue to characterize the woman, the village or the people as *Samaritan* in 4:28-30. The essence of the message here is the fulfillment of the work of the Father. Boers (1988:189) states that 'doing the will of his Father must refer to his activity in general in the story, engaging in conversation with the woman, which leads to her mediating information to the villagers which prompts them to go out to see Jesus for themselves'.

If the doing of his Father's work is inescapably part of Jesus' earthly mission, then the ἔδει in 4:4 can be interpreted as a 'divine necessity' (see also Boers 1988:190). For a full discussion of the theological importance of τὸ θέλημα, τὸ ἔργον, and τοῦ πέμψαντός με see Okure (1988:140-143), Bultmann (1957:143) and Schnackenburg (1965:480-482; 1968:446-448). It is hardly surprising that the images of harvesting are employed, since it is a traditional image for the idea of completion (see O'Day 1986:182; Dodd 1958:316-317; Olsson 1974:226, 241-248; Mt 13).

The character Jesus now continues to explain to the disciples what he meant by completing God's will and work. Okure (1988:145), who regards the missionary aspect of 4:1-42 as constitutive for understanding this dialogue, states regarding 4:34 that it 'encapsulates the key elements proper to the Johannine understanding of mission'.

The interaction between Jesus and the disciples is reflected by the rhetorical question in 4:35, which actually has the illocutionary force of a statement (see Retief 1984:31-34, 139-142). Ponelis (1979:399) states that rhetorical *questions*

are in fact *statements* of a positive or strong affirmative value. Jesus is actually saying that he can, without danger of being contradicted, make a statement as to their beliefs. This belief can be termed a traditional belief and is also expressed in the form of a proverbial statement regarding the time between harvest and sowing. O'Day (1986:135), Morris (1981:278) and Olsson (1974:226) all comment on the fact that this saying is not attested as a proverb outside the New Testament. Okure (1988:148) argues strongly against its being a proverb on the grounds that the time span between sowing and harvesting quoted here is incorrect. However, the evidence here, as well as the opinions of the majority of interpreters, seem to point to the opposite view. It thus seems more than probable that this is a *proverbial saying* because its universal nature, the rhythmical nature (Barrett 1978:241; Dodd 1963:394; Brown 1982,1:173) the traditional introductory formula (cf Mt 16:2) and the fact that in 4:37f another proverb and explanation are found. Okure (1988:147) states the purpose of 4:35a in traditional terms that 'the main purpose of v 35a is to bring to the surface a situation in the disciples [*sic*] own experience.... The technique is a common rhetorical one; it consists in leading the dialogue partner to concede a point from which inference is then drawn or on which a further argument is then built'.

In *speech act* terms, the character Jesus again employs a *preventative* in the form of a *cognitive disclaimer* when he contradicts this proverbial saying. This is necessary, because his contradiction of it is also *contra* the accepted calendars and even against the laws of nature (see Brown 1982,1:174 and Bultmann 1957:144-145; 1971:196-197). The fact that Jesus is obviously violating the *maxim of quality*, which states that no obvious untruths must be told, necessitates his taking measures to reassure the listeners by ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν. Also significant is the twice-repeated imperative form in ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας. The very repetition can, in this instance, indicate that those who must look must be extra perceptive. All these indicate to readers that a non-literal interpretation of his words is necessary. If this is the case, it follows that an applicable non-literal interpretation must be found. If the suspension of the time span between literal sowing and harvesting is an indication that a non-literal sowing and harvesting is meant, it also follows that a non-literal interpretation of the fields ready for harvest, is now applicable. According to speech act theory, in order to keep the CP intact and to still make sense of an utterance where a literal interpretation is not possible, it is necessary to postulate a non-literal interpretation. This non-literal interpretation should be provided by the context. In this case, the context indeed provides the clues for the non-literal interpretation of the data in the text.

In 4:30, it was stated that the people were coming towards the well (ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν). This is further supported by the fact that the whole discourse of Jesus with the disciples is characterized in 4:31 as

'meanwhile' ('Εν τῷ μεταξύ). It seems more than probable that Jesus is not referring to the fields around them (which have to be postulated and for which there is no proof) but to the villagers coming towards them which is a fact clearly stated in the text. The next utterance in 4:36 shifts the attention from the activity of reaping and harvesting to the persons of reaper and the harvester. We have followed the majority of scholars in reading the ἤδη in 4:35b together with 4:36, for instance, Brown (1982,1:182) and Giblin (1983:99). Okure (1988:150) follows Lagrange (1936:120) in stating the opposite. We mention this fact just to clarify our specific reading and interpretation of the text and is not intended as a text critical note.

O'Day (1986:83) offers a satisfactory interpretation regarding the identity of both sower and reaper: 'Jesus' food is to complete that work of the one who sent him; the harvester is to complete the work of the sower. The content and context of v. 36, then, indicate that Jesus is the harvester and God the sower. The emphasis throughout the Fourth Gospel on Jesus' continuation and accomplishment of God's work.'

This interpretation is also accepted by Olsson (1974:227-228), Schnackenburg (1965:483; 1968:450), and others. That the reference of the reaper and the sower can be to the Samaritan woman and Jesus respectively is also a possibility that must be considered. The immediate context where the emphasis is on the work of Jesus and his 'food' would however favor the first interpretation. The character Jesus continues to indicate to his disciples why he said what he did about food, and does not use direct language but language full of metaphors. On the aspects of non-literal illocutionary acts and metaphorical language, see the discussion of Grice (1975b:235-55); Bach and Harnish (1979:65-70); Leech (1983:29,194) and more recently T Du Plessis (1987:200,202) in a discussion on the use in the New Testament. The effect of these metaphors is of course to vividly picture the actions so described. The communicatory effect of the metaphor is much greater than that of the usual assertive, because of its non-literality and the fact that it is extremely economical — very few words can implicate as much information as many sentences can. As with the irony the effect of discovery and the satisfaction of grasping what is meant is also significant and makes for a very strong means of communication.

The character Jesus continues his conversation and again refers to a proverbial statement in 4:37. This is clearly linked to the previous one and can be inferred from the use of γάρ. The ἐν ... τούτῳ, however, refers to the next statement and not the previous one. But, whereas Jesus contradicted the previous proverb, he here confirms it. The focus is on the distinction between sower and reaper. The use of ὁ λόγος for 'proverb' is accepted by Bultmann (1957:146; 1971:198) and Brown (1982,1:182-183). The proverb is, however, not used with its usual Old Testament connotations (see Barrett 1978:242). In the Old Testament, it is a sad day when the one who toiled cannot also enjoy the fruits of his labor, but here it is a day of joy because of the fact that the usual

period of time between sowing and harvesting has been suspended. In 4:36, the Father was pictured as the sower and Jesus as the reaper. By the introduction of more generic terms such as ὁ σπείρων αὐτὸς ὁ θερίζων, the transition to depicting the disciples in this very same position is made easier. The character does not state that this proverb is also one known to the disciples, but the implication is clear.

By referring to a universal truth which is accepted by everyone (the disciples included) and affirming this belief, the distance between Jesus and the disciples is minimized. Where there was considerable distance between them in the beginning of 4:31-38, the affirmation of something which they also hold true indicates that their knowledge is not so inadequate as was stated in 4:32. Jesus and the disciples move even closer to each other when he equates their mission and his in 4:38. Just as he was sent by the Father, so they were sent by him.

The sudden change in tense from *present* to *past* creates temporal difficulties (see Brown 1982,1:183; O'Day 1986:84-86; Barrett 1978:243; Bultmann 1957:147-148; 1971:199-200; Olsson 1974:230-1). Most commentators, for instance, Okure (1988:159), take the position that 4:38 refers to a post-resurrectional situation, and that the aorist is used proleptically. This can be true, but then it is only relevant for the communication between *implied author* and *implied readers*. Nowhere in the Gospel are the characters (on the story level) speaking from this post-Easter perspective. What they say, can often be seen as relevant for the situation of the implied readers, but the implied author is careful to represent the story as story and to keep the credibility of the story intact. Consequently this verse presents one of the most difficult problems of the pericope, as we indicated above.

Commentators cannot explain the sudden switch to the past tense nor can they indicate an instance in the narrative where the sending actually took place, for instance: 'The ἀπέστειλα, for which there is no explanation in the preceding narratives is spoken from the standpoint of later missionary work' (Bultmann 1957:147-148; 1971:199-200). Barrett (1978:243) thinks that this verse should be interpreted allegorically, since it is impossible to give 'a simple and precise interpretation' Brown (1982,1:183) contends: 'First, some suggest that we must place ourselves in the post-resurrectional outlook of the evangelist.... Second, there is the possibility that v.38 is a reference to a mission of the disciples during the ministry of Jesus, a mission that has not been narrated' [Brown's italics]. Schnackenburg (1965:485; 1968:452) is adamant that the aorist is taken seriously and this means 'Jesus places himself mentally in the future, when he has already sent out his disciples'. Boers (1988:192) even go so far as stating: 'There is no way in which one can interpret that comment as part of the story without breaking its temporal integrity; the disciples who are told that they are being sent to reap where they did not work cannot be the disciples in the story.'

Speech act theory can perhaps assist in reaching a decision on this very difficult text. On the story level, the sudden switch to a past tense by the

character Jesus results in a breach of the *maxim of quality* — because no mission of the disciples by Jesus has explicitly been recorded so far. The character Jesus is therefore not telling the truth, and because there is no reason to assume a breakdown of the CP the readers must calculate by means of implicature what the actual meaning of the utterance is. It could be an indication that a non-literal understanding of these verses is necessary, which means that either or both the *sending* or the *temporal aspect* must be interpreted or reformulated. There is no logical or possible way in which the tense can be interpreted or reformulated, so the conclusion must necessarily be that the *sending* is in need of reformulation or that a literal interpretation of the tense is after all necessary. To my mind, it seems that the answer lies in the fact that the violation of the *maxim of quality* is indicative that the sending is the factor that must be made sense of. So while a completely non-literal interpretation is not possible, one must again search for a possible explanation which is literal, but which would also adequately explain the *sending*.

This implies a possible reformulation of the mission of the disciples. Two possibilities come to mind. *First*, the reference could be to the immediate context, that is, 4:35, where his words can possibly be seen as a veiled appointment to mission. This is strengthened by the fact that the past tense used here is the aorist, which could result in a possible translation of something like: 'I have just now sent you'. A further item of support is furnished by the fact that in 4:35 a number of imperatives are used. *Secondly*, the appointment to harvesting could be much more veiled than this. It could be that the disciples are expected to evaluate their relationship with Jesus on the whole and that viewing previous incidents together, may result in the discovery of the fact that they have already been appointed. In this regard, 4:2 (also a difficult verse, 'gap' in Iser's terms) where there was some difficulty in explaining why it is actually mentioned that the disciples are baptizing *on behalf of Jesus*, starts to make sense. If the disciples were baptizing on behalf of Jesus this is just another way of harvesting. They were baptizing the followers of Jesus, in fact, picking the fruits for which Jesus toiled. This means that their association with Jesus already implies an appointment and sending.

We have noted that the insertion of 4:2 seems strange, but it supplies information that would make the words of Jesus to his disciples acceptable. Speech act theory cannot decide which of the two interpretations is the most probable, but it has served us well because it indicates how the author uses the aorist to direct the attention in the narrative to what has already happened. The intended perlocution of the character Jesus would in *both* instances be to make the disciples aware of a situation that *de facto* already exists and thus to reassure them that they are equipped to deal with the situation which is now presenting itself in the form of the approaching Samaritans. A facet which makes this situation unique, however, is the fact that the disciples previously baptized/harvested *Jews*. Now *Samaritans* are to be harvested. The question

with regard to who the 'others' are who toiled is also made a little easier by the above. If the first option 'just now' is taken, then the others who toiled are Jesus and the Samaritan woman. If the second option is taken, then the reference could be to Jesus, John the Baptist or even God. Okure (1988:160) offers the following possibilities of previous 'sowers' and chooses number 6 herself. The alternatives she suggests for the sowers and reapers can be summarized as:

1. Jesus and the woman, with the disciples as reapers.
2. John the Baptist and his followers; Jesus and his disciples as the reapers.
3. The Old Testament prophets; Jesus and his disciples as the reapers.
4. The first disciples, or Philip and those who worked in Samaria; later disciples and workers following them as the reapers.
5. Any previous missionaries in any missionary work.
6. Jesus and the Father, with the disciples as the reapers.

A final and clear solution to the question of the identity of the sower and reaper can only be verified once the whole of the narrative of the Gospel is read, and all the contexts related to this theme examined. A provisional decision must later be validated by the totality of the impact of the Gospel narrative. At this stage it seems that an interpretation where Okure's number 6 is followed will do justice to the data provided by the text so far, and it also seems to do justice to the whole Gospel text.

On the level of *the communication between author and reader*, we find that 4:34-38 contains significant clues to the reader as to the identity of Jesus, just as 4:16-26 did, but it is supplemented by explaining Jesus' function and work. The fact that the disciples are depicted as having less knowledge than the readers, and the fact that the readers can easily see the misunderstanding of the disciples, facilitates their appropriation of the message concerning his identity which he is about to give. His *identity* is closely linked to his *activities* and, therefore, they reveal something of his identity. John 4:34 puts the preceding dialogue into a special light for the readers. Because they know what he is referring to, they can link both the work of Jesus and his fulfilling God's will with the dialogue with the Samaritan woman. because it is of such importance that the readers, even the uninformed readers, fully understand the significance and implications of Jesus' words, the author explicitly states here in 4:34 what he/she meant by 4:32, so that it should not escape their attention. The fact that the disciples' questions are formulated but remain unvoiced throughout this section, is indicative of the fact that the author is really just using the characters to communicate with the readers (see also O'Day 1986:81).

The unity of the work of Jesus and the Father is stressed in 4:34 with regard to the dialogue with the woman, which is exemplary here (see also Okure 1988:140-145). The τοῦ πέμψαντός με and the τελείωσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον

direct the attention of the readers to the full result of Jesus' work, and the future tense τελευώσω especially creates a sense of anticipation in the narrative for the completion of the work. The concepts of doing God's will and completing his work will only be understood to their full extent by the readers once they have read the whole narrative. These concepts have now been referred to. The future tense used in the second clause indicates that it is still to be completed. Although the utterance communicates an important principle to the reader, the expectation is created that more is to follow, that the dialogue with the woman is not the completion of Jesus' ἔργον (see Olsson 1974:224-225). Just as 4:26 communicated a fundamental truth to the readers via the main character's mouth, so 4:34 continues to do so. The pattern is now being set for the self-revealing sequences which follow in the rest of the Gospel.

In 4:35ff, the two references to proverbs have the function of aligning the readers with the disciples in the sense that they were also probably of the same belief — since these proverbs express universal truths. This prepares the way for the readers to sense that what Jesus is saying in denying and confirming the proverbs is also of the same nature, that is, of a universal nature, and applicable to them as well. Although the disciples are involved to some extent in the story level, the author is carefully placing words and expressions of a more generic nature in Jesus' mouth. For instance, he/she uses *participia* and does not address the disciples directly again before 4:38. Although on the story level the dialogue is clearly with the disciples, on the level of the communication between author and readers, the employment of the proverbs, the neutral and generic forms, the veiled promise of eternal life, and the universal truths stated, facilitate the appropriation for themselves by the readers of what is said. If one takes into consideration that the implied readers are of a post-resurrection orientation and probably experienced *harvesting* more than *sowing*, the equating of the worth of both activities seems logical. Explaining all this in universal language makes it applicable to all situations, and the implied readers can easily identify with it. A continuation between Jesus the disciples and the implied readers is thus established and their work is related so that in a covert manner Jesus' work is equated to the harvesting/reaping by the disciples. The whole of 4:34-38 has the very strong illocutionary force of asserting, and because of the universal truths expressed in it and the form of the proverb used, the perlocutionary effect on the readers is to strongly identify with what is said and to view their own activities as a continuation of the events described there. The difficult 4:38 which we have already commented upon, functions on the level of the author/reader communication in much the same way. The reader also has to answer the questions 'where' because of the violation of the *quality maxim*, and consequently discovers that the association with Jesus in fact comes close to an appointment, and the mentioning of their baptizing activities in 4:2 confirms this. This 'gap' of course also directs attention not only to prior events but also to the rest of the Gospel narrative, and wherever this *concept* is mentioned

again, the reader will automatically tend to correlate the two. This is even more of a reality when it is considered that although this all-important aspect of the mission of the disciples is mentioned here, there is no mention of them actually engaging in the 'harvesting' process in this instance. The statement as to their appointment, however, is clear. The subsequent expectation as to their actual activities is not fulfilled in this specific text, so the reader is forced to continue reading to discover the outcome of the implications of 4:31-38.

This short discourse which the author inserted between two scenes with the villagers and which was termed 'meanwhile' in a sense prepares the reader for their arrival, but it is more likely that the author is communicating some fundamental truths about Jesus identity, his mission and the involvement of others in that same mission through his/her use of the story line and the images recalled there. The structure and use of the language are very similar to that of the first dialogue with the woman, where universal truths about worshipping and the division between religious groups were discussed. The story about the Samaritan woman's leaving and the return of the disciples offers the author the chance to communicate very effectively some fundamental truths which will crop up again later in the narrative, but for which the information given here is a necessary prerequisite.

However, the story about the woman is also in need of completion and a satisfactory one at that. The whole question of the mission or harvesting of the disciples is not mentioned again, nor the question of true and false worship, nor the division between Jews and Samaritans, but there are *allusions* to it and while it is not *explicitly* solved, it offers a satisfactory conclusion to the story, while leaving the problems open to be taken up again later.

2.6.4 Brief summary of 4:31-38

In this short interlude while the readers are in anticipation of the arrival of the people called by the woman, the author utilizes the discussion between Jesus and his disciples to interpret for the readers the significance of the dialogue with the woman at the well and the approaching villagers in terms of his mission and the role of subsequent generations in the whole activity of 'harvesting'.

The conversation starts in 4:31 where the disciples urge Jesus to eat. His rather negative response in referring to their offer serves to attract the readers to his side, against the disciples. The disciples are depicted as ignorant and hesitant only for this purpose, and not as a rule, as the rest of the unit indicates. This is a ploy on the part of the author to maximize his/her communication with the readers. The question asked by the disciples in 4:33 also serves the same purpose in the sense that their ignorance facilitates the formulation of the correct answer by the readers. The author is also careful in giving enough clues to the readers to correctly interpret the story, by *inter alia* violating the politeness principle and the maxim of quality. It is also significant that this

dialogue is reminiscent of the dialogue with the woman, with the exception that whereas the woman voiced her doubts, the disciples do not do so.

In 4:43-38, the whole concept of making disciples is introduced and made relevant for the implied readers. The great significance and legitimacy of this activity is explained in terms of Jesus' doing the will of the Father. This immediately serves to link the episode with the Samaritan woman to God's will, and this casts the whole scene in a different light. If any readers still had any doubts regarding the appropriateness of Jesus' behavior in violating social customs, this inappropriate conduct is now shown to be in line with God's will.

The alignment of Jesus' work with God's mission, the strong illocutionary force of the rhetorical question, the reference to universal truths, the cognitive disclaimer used by Jesus, and the somewhat strange temporal references all serve to indicate that the ideas expressed here transcend this specific context. This means that the implied readers can easily appropriate the truths expressed in this way for themselves. From this it follows that as the sending of the disciples is *de facto* included in their association with Jesus, so the association of others, like the readers, with Jesus can also possibly imply the same. In this way the author has, by describing the conversation between Jesus and the disciples in this specific manner, actually forced the readers to interpret the dialogue with the woman in the light of his doing God's work, and the fact that his disciples are actually continuing his work. If one takes the implied readers as viewing the narrative from a post-resurrectional viewpoint, this interlude is a powerful way of interpreting the dialogue and motivating readers to act in a specific manner.

The speech acts used in this section:

v 31: 'Εν τῷ μεταξύ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες, 'Ραββί, φάγε.

form: imperative

type of illocution: directive (requestive)

perlocution: The disciples want Jesus to eat the food they bought.

v 32: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 'Εγὼ βρώσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: In asserting that he has access to other food Jesus wants them to understand that something has occurred which made this possible, and he intends them to speculate on the nature of this food. The reference to their inadequate knowledge is to distance himself a little from them.

v 33: ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Μὴ τις ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν;

form: question

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The disciples do not realize the intended perlocution of the previous utterance. They do not ask about the nature of this food, but rather the source. They are negating the fact that Jesus could have obtained any. The readers are to align themselves with Jesus and correct the misunderstanding of the disciples, and answer the question.

v 34: λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The status of Jesus is confirmed. The disciples should not only stop questioning his actions but should rather view it in a new light. The readers are to interpret the whole of the previous section in this light — that is, that the whole dialogue with the woman is part of Jesus' divine calling. All negative perceptions regarding Jesus' transgression of social norms are to be corrected.

v 35a: οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ὡτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμός ἐρχεται;

form: question

type of illocution: statement (assertive)

perlocution: In asserting that this is a common saying, both the disciples and the readers are to perceive that a universal truth is about to be stated.

v 35b: ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν,

form: imperative

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: By drawing attention to his close relationship with God in 4:34 Jesus has confirmed his status. It is on the grounds of this status that he now begins to contradict the universal saying, by using this preventative. The disciples are to understand that the following utterance is based on his superior position, and therefore acceptable.

ν 35c: ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν.

form: imperative

type of illocution: directive (requirement)

perlocution: The form of the imperative is used to direct the attention of both the disciples to the ripe harvest. Because of the fact that this contradicts the accepted truth, the intention is that the utterance is not taken literally, but that the approaching Samaritans are connected with the concept of harvest.

ν 36: (ἤδη) ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: Again this utterance is directed at both readers and disciples. The form of the utterance and the generic nature of it induce the readers to accept this as a universal truth, and the idea that this sort of activity is praiseworthy and worthwhile is also communicated. The intended perlocution is to get the readers to act in this fashion.

ν 37-38: ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὅτι "Ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων. 38 ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (confirmative)

perlocution: All the utterances in 4:37-38 serve the same purpose here and are therefore treated as a unit. The confirmatives used here serve to indicate that the accepted proverb is true, and that the deduction from it in 4:38 is consequently also universally true. The violation of the maxim of quality in 4:38, and the subsequent interpretation that association with Jesus is also appointment, has the perlocutionary effect on readers that they should realize that *any* association with Jesus will result in this state of affairs.

2.6.5 4:39-42: Conclusion of the story

Text:

39 Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης ὅτι Εἰπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα. 40 ὥς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρίται, ἠρώτων αὐτὸν μέναι παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας. 41 καὶ πολλῶ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, 42 τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλίαν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

Well aware of the fact that the short interlude described above could have confused his/her readers, the author quickly recaps, in 4:39, the incidents that were implicitly stated in 4:30. When the woman arrived at the village, *no* response from the villagers to her words was recorded; only the fact that they started coming towards Jesus. Curiosity, real belief, faith? The reader are left in the dark as to the real effect of her words, since she also does not state clearly the nature of her faith. It is, therefore, necessary to resolve the suspense created and to relieve the readers of this tension. Significantly, it is also the *first positive response* in this specific context to any of the characters' words. The woman replied negatively to Jesus' request in 4:7,9; when the woman asked Jesus for the living water, he did not react positively but requested her to find her husband; when he revealed his identity she left; no response to her words to the villagers was at first recorded; Jesus did not eat as the disciples requested of him. Here we find the first positive response to any request. The question of their reaction to the woman is now solved, but their reaction to Jesus himself is more fully recorded in 4:40. When they request Jesus to stay with them, again there is a positive response — he stayed there two days. The positive responses are further exploited when in 4:41 another positive response is recorded. The response of the villagers to invite Jesus is framed by a chiastic construction which emphasizes that this invitation is not made on the grounds of humanitarian reasons, but on the grounds of faith. Finally, in 4:42, the total content of their positive response as a group is recorded in their statement of belief. A happy and climactic ending indeed!

Also of note in this regard is the fact that also for the first time in the narrative the underlying intertext of the betrothal scene is positively re-enacted. What readers could expect indeed happens — the male figure at the well is asked to stay over and he consents. The only difference here is that it is not for a betrothal or marriage, but for a spiritual bonding. We will return to this aspect shortly.

On the significance of the period of *two days*, Okure (1988:179) remarks that it is proof that Jesus is non-discriminating, because 'it was the Jews who kept aloof from the Samaritans, not the other way around'. Since his message is that

his coming is to be of benefit for everybody, Okure (1988:179) further states that by staying over he is practically illustrating this message. She continues:

According to *Didache* (11,5), two days was the traditional length of stay in any one place expected of the genuine missionary/prophet. It was also not uncommon for converts to request their evangelizers to stay with them as proof that these missionaries really believed in the genuineness of their conversion (Acts 16:14-15). As we know from other sources, the issue of fellowship was the single most important social problem facing the early Christians.

Many of the problems and difficulties with which the characters struggled in the previous section are resolved here. In 4:39, the word *Samaritan* is again used, whereas it was last utilized in the dialogue with the woman where it was an issue. It has not been used in the text at all, since 4:27, although there was reference to the woman, the village and the villagers. By mentioning the 'Samaritan(s), the *economy principle* has not been observed here in the sense that too much information or unnecessary information was given — information without which the reader would have been perfectly able to process the utterance. This rule-breaking is therefore communicating something to the readers — focusing their attention to the fact that the word used here is significant, and that they must, therefore, calculate the possibilities. It seems probable that the author is indicating to the readers that the differences of culture and religion between Jesus and the Samaritans is again on the cards. Having been informed that there is an hour coming, which is now, that these differences will not matter, and the fact that these differences did not matter in the immediately preceding verses, serves to create a sense of suspense and expectation within the readers as to the outcome of the confrontation with the villagers. The sudden resolution of the suspense when nothing happens and Jesus and the disciples stay over, is a powerful means of actualizing the message of 4:16-26. Furthermore, the readers are also able to identify with the actions of the protagonist Jesus, whose apparent wrong social behavior in this whole episode is vindicated by his words in 4:34. His staying with the Samaritans is no longer socially unacceptable but is the logical and necessary consequence of his mission. If we grant that Pratt (1977:147-149) is correct in stating that literary works can be classified as *display texts*, and that they are of an asserting nature, then this segment of text, 4:39-40, which mainly has the illocutionary force of asserting, can be described in terms of Pratt (1977:136) as follows:

Assertions whose relevance is tellability must represent states of affairs that are held to be unusual, contrary to expectations, or otherwise problematic;... In making an assertion whose relevance is tellability, a speaker is not only reporting but also *verbally* displaying a state of affairs, inviting his addressee(s) to join him in contemplating it, evaluating it, and responding to it. His point is to produce in his hearers not only belief but also an imaginative and affective involvement in the state of affairs he is representing and an evaluative stance toward it.

This means that the hearers/readers are to share in the author's experience of the event. The implied author in our text is not only informing the readers about the nature and conduct of Jesus in this text, he/she is, by using the language in this specific way, trying to get them to adopt the same attitude and perhaps, if applicable, adopt the same actions as those described in the assertions. So while the story reaches a satisfactory conclusion, the readers are also induced in the process to adopt similar points of view and conduct. In 4:41 the reaction of the group of the Samaritans is described. Their total reaction is described here at the end of the narrative, and then the actual content of the proposition is kept till the end of the utterance. This is in accordance with both the *end-focus maxim*, and the *end-weight maxim* which 'recommends that if the rules of the language allow it, the part of a clause which contains new information should be placed at the end' (Leech 1983:22).

Strictly speaking, the new information is to be found in the words ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου. It is, however, new only on the *story level* since that for the first time the characters utter this. The information is not so new on the level of the readers who are perfectly knowledgeable about the identity of Jesus. Of significance here is, therefore, not only the *content* of the statement as such, but also the *identity* of the characters who make it. In this case it is the *Samaritans* who were previously depicted as 'not-knowing', but are now saying οἶδμεν — 'we know'. There is progression from believing on the grounds of the testimony of the woman διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναίκος, to believing the words of Jesus διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, to a statement of faith based on their own conviction and knowledge. This is the real climax of the narrative and the perlocution of the utterance is that the readers are persuaded that the belief of the Samaritans also coincides with their own. This is supported by the fact that the words ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου are used by them here, and ἡ σωτηρία is used by Jesus in 4:22. Whereas ἡ σωτηρία was depicted as being from the 'Jews', the acceptance of this fact by the Samaritans serves to indicate that the termination of the hostilities between Jew and Samaritan which 4:23f alludes to, has indeed become a reality. The author by using these words together with the word κόσμος has indicated to the readers something of the universal nature of the whole episode. Worship becomes universal and divisions of the past are suspended, the work of harvesting by the disciples is described in the same terms, and the belief of the Samaritans is part of a greater whole. (Significantly this is the only instance in John's Gospel where the word σωτὴρ is used.)

One last observation regarding the intertext must be made. The images described by the author recall the scenes of the Old Testament but, as Staley (1986a:177-185) has noted, while the expectation of the readers were raised on a number of occasions, they were dashed repeatedly. This concluding scene, however, provides an aspect which is fulfilled — Jesus indeed goes home with the people of the village, but this only affirms that a relationship has been established between Jesus and the villagers/woman different from the one the

type-scenes predict, and this is shown in the utterance by the townspeople. Staley (1986a:183) indicates that the changes made to the type-scene in this pericope serve to indicate that the author is taking a new direction in implementing the intertext of the type-scene. He concludes that 'in verse 34a, we find that Jesus has spiritual food that nourishes him, and it is a spiritual purpose that motivates him... the emphasis in the type-scene will be upon the ensuing spiritual relationship which is established — not only between Jesus and the woman — but also between Jesus and the entire town' (Staley 1986a:183).

These concluding verses of John 4:1-42 serve as a very powerful and positive conclusion to the whole narrative, and in a way they are also the climax of the whole narrative. It is important to note that while the conversations and dialogue often fail on the story level, the all important communication between author and reader is carefully kept intact and the CP is observed at all times — and the flouting of certain rules, for example, irony, only serves to make the communication more effective. The use of the language by the author can perhaps be summed up in the words of Iser (1978:142): 'What the language *says* is transcended by what it *uncovers*, and what it *uncovers* represents its true meaning. Thus the meaning of the literary work remains related to what the printed text says but it requires the creative imagination of the reader to put it all together' [Iser's italics].

In the next chapter, we will offer a few observations regarding the style of the Fourth Gospel, based on this reading of the text.

2.6.6 Brief summary of 4:39-42

This concluding section constitutes a neat tidying up of the loose ends remaining after the vital communication between implied author and readers in the foregoing sections.

As we indicated the unsatisfactory (for the readers) utilization of the intertext is at last resolved adequately, and the character Jesus enters into a special relationship with the villagers. It also becomes clear that the woman did understand Jesus correctly, and that her testimony was effective. Although the Samaritans are again mentioned by name, the religious schism between the two parties is now nullified and true worship can become possible, because of their faith. They are also depicted as people who now have come to have adequate knowledge. The progression of the quality is also expressed by a climactic progression in the chiasmic structure of 4:39-42: that they believe first through hearsay, then because of the words of Jesus, and finally their ultimate conviction is based on their own experience and knowledge.

Finally the climax is reached when the Samaritans as a group express their belief in Jesus not in the terms offered by the woman, but by οἶδμεν, which is a climactic summary of the identity of Jesus: an identity which has been

questioned by the woman, the implied author, the disciples, and even the implied readers. The speech acts in this section are:

v 39: Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυροῦσης ὅτι Εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The readers are to be released from the tension when it is stated that the testimony of the woman was indeed as positive as could be hoped.

v 40: ὥς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρίται, ἡρώτων αὐτὸν μένειν παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: The positive reactions of both Jesus and the Samaritans indicate to the readers that this type of program can be successful and is worthwhile to imitate. This provides a good incentive for adopting a similar type of behavior.

v 41: καὶ πολλῶ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: Again the positive reaction of the Samaritans, this time to the words of Jesus, is recorded. The intended perlocution is much the same as the above.

v 42: τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλίαν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

form: statement

type of illocution: constative (assertive)

perlocution: This final utterance by the Samaritans serves to convince readers that the implications and possibilities of the previous utterances have indeed been realized, and that the story so far has been successful.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS REGARDING JOHANNINE STYLE BASED ON A SPEECH ACT READING OF JOHN 4:1-42

1. Introduction

It must be stressed here that our reading of John 4:1-42 in terms of speech act theory is to a great extent experimental and new, and could possibly be refined extensively. However, the fact remains that this approach offered us some additional ways of analyzing texts, and of combining aspects relevant to the function of texts, which are helpful in explaining the dynamics of the text. Since we have completed the reading of the text by utilizing speech act theory in the previous chapter, we can now conclude this study by offering a few suggestions regarding Johannine style based on this reading. Our observations are, of course, based on the reading of chapter 4:1-42, and what we argue here is, of course, valid for this pericope in the first instance. However, this does not mean that these observations are not relevant for the rest of the Gospel. The provisional remarks we offer here should also be tested against a reading of the whole of the Gospel. Unfortunately, for practical reasons, we have to limit ourselves to this particular pericope only. The experimental nature of the study must also be taken into account here — in the sense that we have not attempted an exhaustive account of Johannine style, but that we have explored the possibility that a more comprehensive approach to Johannine style is possible and desirable. The result of this study necessarily calls for a more definite analysis of Johannine style based on the results offered here.

2. Johannine style in John 4:1-42

We have indicated in chapter two that we are dealing with style from the perspective of the communication of the text, that is, from a pragmatic perspective. This means that style is more than the mere listing of devices and features. The function of these devices and features also needs to be elucidated. We have also opted for intrinsic, explanatory stylistics (Leech 1985:39) since this is most suitable for the stylistic description of Johannine style, that is, for the style of a religious text. It also means that we are not attempting to describe only *Greek* style or the function of language in *general*, but are concentrating on features and programs in the text in front of us which will enhance successful communication in a specific text. All the above will regulate our approach to style here, and will determine the choices we make in

describing style. We have argued strongly in favor of speech act theory as a possible approach to style. As the subsequent discussion will indicate, the way in which utterances and speech acts are approached and the dynamics of the text described, encompasses most of the facets of style our specific approach to style necessitates. In this respect, we have found speech act theory very useful in approaching Johannine style. While speech act theory is not exactly equal to 'style', it embraces many of the concepts necessary to specifically practice intrinsic, explanatory stylistics. Because speech act theory allows for a number of perspectives in its approach to language, it means that these concepts, such as reception theory, are also available to us, and can be incorporated in our understanding of the text.

2.1 *General observations*

We will start our discussion regarding the style of this pericope by making two very general observations, after which we will enter into a more detailed discussion regarding some of the points raised in the general observations.

2.1.1 An impression regarding style

Perhaps an appropriate place to start our discussion of Johannine style in this particular pericope is to give an overall *impression* of it. Speech act theory has taught us to consider utterances in terms of their success. While this is true of single utterances, it is also true of larger units of communication. Our functional approach to style compels us to remark on this aspect. It is our belief that in John 4:1-42 we have a very successful unit of communication. Of course this is a subjective statement based on our experience of reading the text, but two additional factors also play a role in this evaluation of the text. In the first place, we must stress that our reading is not a naive reading — we have read the text from the vantage point of modern linguistics, stylistics and literary theory, and after this more technical approach, we also conclude that the communication appears successful. Secondly, the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of this Johannine pericope also tends to confirm this view, as do the plethora of publications on these verses. The fact that this literary work which we call 'the Gospel of John' has found its way into a religious corpus called the Bible, is also an indication that the communication of this text is acceptable, and furthermore, the judgments of modern scholars regarding this particular pericope in John also confirm this view.

The success of this narrative lies in the way in which the implied author uses the language to achieve a communicative goal. While there are, of course, some differences in interpreting detail, one can say that on the whole scholars agree that some basic Christological, socio-political and religious aims are achieved. The way in which the pericope is structured, the speech acts

employed, the figures of speech used, and the Greek language in general utilized, is so overt and clear that communication is possible, and the total impact of the utterances successful. The use of covert means to really drive home a particular point, enhances the success of this narrative. We will return to this particular point.

2.1.2 Style and choice

I have also argued strongly in chapter two that style is closely aligned to *choice*. The choices exercised in the text also have reference to the style. These choices include aspects such as the setting of the scenes, the choice of characters participating, the implied socio-cultural context, the use of certain options in language to achieve maximum effect, the way in which the implied author ensures continued reader participation, the choices made by the implied author regarding his privileged position, the choices made by the implied author to foreground certain aspects, and so on. Out of innumerable options in the language, possible contexts and characters, the text offers a limited number of choices made in order to maximize the communication process. All these choices pertain to style and should not merely be listed; their function should also be indicated.

2.2. Ensuring readers' involvement

A close examination of the speech act summary we provided at the end of each section will reveal how often the function of certain utterances was indicated as 'involving readers', 'enhancing *attentio*', 'ensuring reader participation' and so on. This is a feature of the style of the text — that there are built-in devices to ensure the attention of the readers and, of course, their participation, not only at the beginning or end of significant sections. We find that throughout the text the language is used in this way. For instance, the tension created in 4:1-3 by the hints of possible danger, and the incomplete motivation given for actions, serve this purpose. The journey into Samaria, the problematic socio-religious context, the strange behavior of the traditional Rabbi Jesus, also demand attention and concentration. The problematic arrival of the woman, the apparent disregard of traditions and the hinting at the intertext of the type-scene, keep up a fair amount of suspense and hence reader's attention. The readers are also involuntarily involved in the narrative by devices such as irony and misunderstanding, where they are able to understand the ironies and misunderstandings and become 'insiders', and participants in the conversation. The utilization of maxims such as the end-focus maxim is also conducive to this effect. The creation of 'gaps' and the structuring of utterances so that the problems can only be resolved by implicature, also force readers to participate in the reading program, if they want to make sense of the communication. We

have, in this pericope, a very good example of how readers' participation and involvement are ensured and kept intact by a wide variety of techniques.

2.3. *The manipulation/victimization/unstabling of readers*

This feature of the style is also very conspicuous in the text. The dynamics of the text in these terms is closely linked to the aforementioned paragraph. It does indeed seem that we have the possibility of a literary device so far undistinguished in the Gospel of John. As we have mentioned in referring to Staley's (1986a) discussion of this, it seems that the reader victimization or 'wrong-footing' of the reader is much more extensive than he postulates. Throughout the whole narrative, the readers are subjected to a constant manipulation of wide variety.

First, they are subjected to *suspense* in 4:4-5a, reassured that all is in order (4:6b) only to be subjected to a more intensified suspense where the reassurances are again dashed by the arrival of the woman and the invoking of the type-scene in 4:7. The fact that Jesus' communication with the woman fails right from the start and that her positive reaction remains hidden from the readers right up to the concluding section of the narrative also accounts for a fair amount of suspense. The fact that the type-scene usually culminates in a union between the male and female figures also provides ample grounds for apprehension and suspense since this is unthinkable in the whole context, and is also impossible with regard to what the readers know about Jesus.

Secondly, the readers are also wrong-footed by forcing them into involuntary *association* and *disassociation* with certain characters. For instance, in 4:7ff the protagonist Jesus engages in socially unacceptable behavior. He is not only criticized by social tradition but also by the woman and the implied author! This creates an enormous problem for readers who are supposed to identify with the protagonist. The use of the language has left the readers no choice but to share the criticisms. However in 4:10-15 the ironies, misunderstandings, and the explanations by the character Jesus again leave the readers no choice but to correct their previous views and to associate with Jesus. Right through the narrative, the readers find that they have involuntarily changed places. At certain stages the readers cannot help but feel sympathy for the woman or the disciples, only to find themselves separated from them by irony and so on. The readers constantly change places.

Thirdly, the readers are induced by the use of the invoking of the type-scene to expect certain events and actions. These *expectations* are seldom realized in the narrative. For instance, the type-scene requires that the request for water is not denied. However, this is not realized, and the woman refuses to give water to Jesus. The type-scene furthermore requires that the female figure is a virgin or at least nubile. In 4:16 Jesus asks this female figure to call her husband, which dashes the expectation created by the description of the well scene.

However, these expectations are again raised when she denies that she has a husband and Jesus even grants that she is speaking the truth in 4:17. However, his utterance in 4:18 completely destroys these expectations. Only at the end of the narrative are some of the expectations created by the intertext realized.

This device of unstabling or of wrong-footing the readers is, of course, very functional. On the one hand, it maximizes reader participation and involvement, because they never know what to expect next, and on the other, it enhances the communication in such a way that the message is actually formulated by the readers themselves because they are forced to evaluate and re-evaluate their opinions, beliefs and perceptions.

2.4 The stylistic choice of the context

The socio-cultural context chosen as the background for the narrative is also of extreme importance for the successful communication. The fact that it is situated in Samaria immediately communicates a mass of implicit information. Although it seems that the implied readers are considered to be knowledgeable about the schism between Jews and Samaritans and the fact that we as modern readers have at least to some extent knowledge about the situation, the fact remains that, through the narrative and the words of the characters, enough information is supplied to enable even uninformed readers to grasp the problematic and unusual situation implied. This is ensured by direct communication with the readers in the form of asides, and the script the characters use also give enough information to enable the uninformed reader to experience the full impact of the problematic situation.

The geographical context of the narrative is indicated as Samaria. That there is great significance attached to this fact is indicated by overly emphasizing it. The fact that the action takes place on Samaritan soil is indeed greatly stressed — see 4:4,5,7 and 9 (three times). We have remarked on this and indicated that it is so conspicuous because it actually constitutes the breaking of the economy principle. This is a clear indication that Samaria is an issue here. The asides by the author, and the subsequent dialogue between Jesus and the woman also stress the fact that Jews and Samaritans are supposed to be hostile towards each other. The fact that Jesus as a male is conversing alone with a female is also stressed and indicated as problematic — see 4:8 and 4:27. However, of equal significance is the total absence of these overt and covert references to the religious differences from 4:27 onwards. Clearly the differences are not stressed because the universal nature of belief in God and of ‘harvesting’ is indicated. In 4:39f, the word ‘Samaritans’ occurs twice — again somewhat redundantly. It seems that the socio-political and culturo-religious differences are stressed in the beginning, to indicate and emphasize how great these differences really are. The dialogue between Jesus and the woman and the discussion from 4:27-32, serve to indicate that this schism and differences with regard to worship are

actually nullified by Jesus' mission. This is accomplished by using more universal terms and attaching very little or even no relevance to the socio-religious context. In 4:39-42, the differences are again referred to implicitly, but now to indicate how this nullification of differences is actualized in practice. It does indeed seem that the socio-religious context invoked here, serves as an example of how Christian belief and the tension with respect to an opposing belief can be overcome. It is possibly only because Christianity is not linked to a specific shrine, method or place of worship. In actual fact, the issue is not really the Samaritan question at all — the context of the Samaritan-Jewish problem is only used as vehicle to convey this more universal message, and is therefore very functional. The socio-cultural and religious context is also used throughout the narrative to maximize certain effects. We will only refer to a few, since our analysis of the text has already indicated these. For instance, the problematic nature of Jesus' approaching the woman is made even more significant by the clear indication in 4:9 that this is culturally and religiously unacceptable behavior. Also the example Jesus sets in staying over for two days with the so-called unclean Samaritans is much more significant and effective as an example than if the whole context were differently indicated.

The above discussion is a clear example of how a speech act reading 'offers the means to orient literature away from various formalisms which detach the text from its historical and social matrix, towards its concrete context' (White 1988:2).

2.5 *Rules and rule-breaking*

The notion of speech acts can also help to *identify* certain key notes in the text. Since language is considered to be rule-governed behavior in this context, our analysis of the text in these terms has indicated quite a few instances where the rules were deliberately not observed and in fact flouted, and which indicates significant moments in the communication. In this way, it is not only possible to determine the occurrence of such significant instances, but also to explain why these occurrences attract attention. So far commentators and exegetes have mostly identified these instances on an intuitive basis. Speech act theory can explain why this is so and can also provide some valuable insights for achieving a better understanding of this. Two good examples are the very difficult 4:16 and 4:38. If texts which do not seem very significant are read in the light of rule-breaking, it seems that the fact that rules are not observed, is indeed of great significance for the style and the understanding of the text. For instance, the way in which the place of the meeting between Jesus and the woman is described in 4:5f seems on the surface quite a normal way of doing it. However, a speech act reading indicates that this description constitutes a deviation from the rules of economy and relevance, and that the implied author is definitely indicating something more with the way in which the language is used here.

The fact that the exact position of the well, the place names, the names of the patriarchs and so on are mentioned facilitates the invoking of the all important type-scene a little later. Similarly, the very small detail in 4:28, that the woman left her water jar behind is in effect a violation of a principle, and therefore significant. Also very close to these observations is the fact that the ironies and misunderstandings can be explained in much the same terms, that is, in terms of rule breaking. This provides a new way of looking at figures of speech, and of explaining their significance. In our analysis of the text, we have briefly referred to the function of, *inter alia*, irony in this pericope. We have indicated that it manipulates the readers to become 'insiders' and that this is a very strong communicative device. However, the origin of this device lies in the rule-breaking principle contained in speech act theory. We have also indicated that the violation of rules in most instances calls for the resolution of the problems thus created by means of implicature. This is also a way in which readers are forced to participate in the narrative and to gain a higher experience of the text. The implications of rule non-observance for the study of style is a so far unexplored area.

2.6 The interaction of the various style features

This is an aspect which speech act theory can highlight as no other language theory can. Implicit in all of the above discussion is the fact that all the ploys, strategies and devices in the text are very much intertwined. The rule-breaking, the reader manipulation and involvement, the implied context, the figures of speech, the choices implicit in the text, and so on, all combine to make the language/communication of the text effective. These aspects are inseparable, and only when the text is read and experienced as a totality, can the full impact of the intertwinement be felt. Our analysis so far has clearly shown that the style of this pericope is of a complex nature, where important grammatical or syntactical eccentricities can be indicated or listed. The speech act analysis has proved the point made in chapter II, to the effect that only a comprehensive approach to the text can do justice to the style. It is not only a few singularities that render the text effective, but it is the whole complex interaction of various literary devices, speech acts, rule observation and non-observation, linguistic, narratological and reception theoretical strategies combined, that constitute and determine the dynamics of the text. Each one of these facets can, of course, be isolated and indicated, but to understand the style of the text, only an analysis which focuses on the combination of these devices, can provide adequate insights into the style of the Gospel. All these devices are, of course, carried by and mediated through the vocabulary, syntax and grammar of the Greek language, but these are only the building blocks of style, and not style itself. To consider these items as 'stylistic' would be to overestimate their relative value. They also need to be seen as part of a whole universe of style where the

interaction of a large number of aspects provides a comprehensive and functional whole, and not only a few isolated items. White (1988:58) argues that 'the effect of syntax on the reader often is the most powerful force in determining the response of the reader.... The theoretical integration of this level into the foundations of speech act theory is still weak, but it is clear that much profitable work can be done on this problem'. Our critique of the traditional way of approaching style centers around the observation of the very simplistic and one-sided use of syntax in style.

2.7 The use of intertexts

Without attempting to indulge in the complexities of poststructuralism and the implications of deconstruction for the epistemological status of 'text', we will have to say something on intertextuality in John 4:1-42. If we grant Derrida (1979:84) and Ryan (1985:16) that texts are continually referring to other texts and have traces of other texts, and that this in fact accounts for their meaning, then new avenues of reading the text of John become possible. This is even more relevant if we consider the fact that in John 4 intertextuality is deliberately and overtly exploited. The deliberate structuring of the narrative to invoke the intertext of the type-scene of betrothal enables the readers to assign meaning to this particular text in such a way that it is comparable to but not identical with the intertext referred to. In this way, readers are guided to assign meaning to a specific text with reference to the implied intertext. If we keep in mind that this strategy is also deliberately employed, then the intertext becomes even more significant in assisting the readers in assigning meaning to the text. Even more so, if we keep in mind that the use of the intertext functions together with a multitude of other language aspects which serve to steer the readers in a specific direction, and afford them the opportunity of producing their own meaning and text according to their repertoire. We realize, of course, that each and every utterance is in fact referring to other prior texts, but part of the style in this particular text is to choose to highlight or foreground a few of these intertexts to direct the readers in assigning meaning to the text. When we dealt with the text, we indicated these instances. We have discovered this only because speech act theory allows for the implementation of, inter alia, reception theory in its descriptive apparatus, and reception theory as a poststructuralist method open new horizons for stylistics to view style as such. However, the compatibility of structural and poststructural methodologies needs further attention in this regard. Suffice it to say that there are new ways open to perceive texts and, of course, style.

2.8 *Realism of the verbal interaction*

Another important aspect our speech act reading illuminated, is the way in which the *dialogues* in the text are created. The application of speech act principles to these dialogues revealed that it was possible in the pericope to apply the theory successfully to the utterances. This means that the dialogues and utterances were created in such a way as to represent real dialogue and human interaction. This helped in reading the literary speech acts and offered the possibility of 'integrating literary discourse into the same basic model of language as all our other communicative activities' (Pratt 1977:88). The fact that even the characters observe the appropriateness conditions regulating the verbal exchange they are engaged in, contributes to the acceptability and effect of the text. This is important because the text of John as a religious text claims to tell the story about Jesus. If the utterances do not sound realistic or possible, both the effect of the story and the credibility of the author will be jeopardized. The realism of the text contributes a great deal towards the actual success of the story. While on the whole the appearance of reality was kept intact, there are a few instances where the text reveals a deviation from this pattern. For instance, the fact that the woman keeps misunderstanding Jesus in 4:15, despite the fact that it is clearly and unequivocally stated what the meaning of his words is, is not very likely. However, this gives the readers an opportunity to formulate crucial points for themselves. Similarly the way in which the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples develops is also not in accordance with the expected. He answers questions not directed at him or even voiced. Is this perhaps an oversight on the part of the author, or could lapses of this kind be stylistically motivated in order to draw readers' attention to the communication between implied author and implied readers? It does seem possible, but only a thorough investigation into the whole Gospel text will indicate if this is indeed part of the style of the text.

2.9 *Style and interpersonal communication*

Speech act theory also provided us with the means of examining the text and its narrative structure in terms of interpersonal communication. The concepts of appropriateness conditions, conversational rules, principles and maxims, and language conventions all contribute in obtaining new and deeper insight into the dynamics of the narrative. We have used the narratological constructs of implied author and implied readers and the characters in the text. This was combined with the whole question, so important in speech act theory, of describing utterances in terms of interpersonal acts designed to achieve certain conversational aims. The way in which the relationship between the implied author and readers is constructed now becomes more accessible to us and can, in terms of the style of the Gospel, be described and the function of this

relationship can be established. The fact that a literary speech situation provides the author with a privileged position over and against the readers is one such insight. Part of the style of the text is the way in which the author utilizes this privileged position in dealing with the implied readers. Certain devices such as irony, are employed to induce readers to disassociate themselves from characters. The author takes care to ensure attention and participation, and acknowledges this privileged position in a number of ways in the prologue as we have indicated. The author also tries to justify his story in a number of ways, such as placing problematic utterances only after disclaimers, once he/she ensured that the readers are sympathetic towards the character uttering these words. A good example of this is found in 4:43-38. Suffice it to say that speech act theory provides new ways of using established notions of, for instance, narratology and of depicting the relationships in the text in this light. This also provides additional insights which are of significance for style.

2.10 Different levels of communication in the text

The fact that speech act theory is able to accommodate so many aspects of narratology, has assisted us in relating this aspect of textual communication to style. Our reading of the text indicated that the communication on the different levels in the text, need not necessarily coincide. Because speech act theory emphasizes the success of utterances, it provides a new perspective of viewing communication of texts. We have already indicated that we find the communication of the total narrative very effective. However, this is not necessarily the case on the level of the characters. We have indicated how the communication of the protagonist Jesus with the woman actually fails on this level in 4:7b-15. The failure on this level enhances the success of the communication on the level of the implied author and readers, as our analysis has indicated. It will also be worthwhile to examine the whole of the Gospel narrative in terms of the success or failure of interpersonal communication, and how this influences the communication between implied author and readers.

2.11 The style 'between the lines'

Speech act theory also afforded us the opportunity to perceive aspects which are of crucial importance for the meaning of the text, while these aspects are not actually in the text before us. This is an important insight which a structuralist reading of a text could never supply us with. We are, of course, referring to the implicit rules which govern the illocutionary force of utterances, rules governing interpersonal rhetoric, speech situations and so on. These rules are crucial and inseparable components of the communication process, but are not part of the *linguistic* structure of the text and constitute extra-textual elements. In this way something of the intentionality of utterances and even of the whole of the text

can become visible, and can become part of the considerations of the style of the text. Patte (1988:91) states: 'The intentionality (illocutionary force) which is part of the meaning of... [an] utterance is not marked by the text (propositional content) itself. It takes the form of an "absence", or, in Iser's terminology, we could say that it is a "gap", indeed a gap that the reader has to fill in so as to make sense of the text.' The way in which this is utilized in John 4 was discussed in the previous chapter, and is of great significance to understand something about the style of the Gospel.

2.12 Speech act theory and reception theory

We have already referred to the fact that one lasting impression of a speech act reading of John 4:1-42 is that various aspects of language, in combination, constitute the dynamics of the text. The comprehensive nature of this theory of language allows fully for the implementation combinations of hitherto uncombined aspects of text and literature sciences. An excellent example is the fact that concepts of reception theory have been implemented fully and used in combination with other aspects. This provided us with perspectives on the text from various angles. On the one hand, in the concepts illocution and perlocution, the focus is on the inherent intention of certain utterances. The utterances and the text are interpreted in terms of this; it is clear that the 'focus of attention is on the production of meaning by the author' (Patte 1988:91). On the other hand, reception theory allows for a consideration of the text from the perspective of the production of meaning by the readers. In both these approaches, the focus is on extratextual facets, and while they do not negate everything the structuralist methods have to offer, they 'are a necessary complement to those approaches which are exclusively text centered' (Patte 1988:91). For style studies this means that we now have descriptive apparatus for describing texts not only in structuralist terminology, but also in terms of some additional extratextual considerations. Furthermore, the very important notion of 'gaps' in the text which we addressed in the detailed analysis is also applicable to better comprehend the style. According to Patte (1988:91), the methodology offered by reception theory can 'provide us with strategies which could apply to the task of apprehending the "gaps" which express in the form of absence the intentionality of the text. But conversely, speech act theory should help clarify and refine the methodology of reader criticism'.

In addition, it should be kept in mind that an approach such as reception theory is essentially a poststructural approach to texts, and the epistemological implications of this for the status of (religious) texts have not yet been spelled out. The legitimacy and implications of combining structuralist and poststructuralist methodologies also need future attention.

2.13 Characteristic usages

Our analysis of the 'traditional' approach to style indicated the futility of attempting to delineate Johannine style against a specific norm or corpus of writings. It is our contention that the style characteristics of a text should not merely be listed, but that the function and the total communication of the text should rather be considered. However, the frequency of use of certain literary and textual devices could provide additional stylistic insight into Johannine style. But this means that the text should be examined not only to establish the frequency of grammatical, syntactical, and traditional literary devices, but also in the light of frequently occurring strategies where a whole number of textual and extratextual factors are combined to achieve a particular effect. Unfortunately, we were unable to attempt this in the limited space available here, but this is definitely an item that must be put on a future agenda, and one which will really enhance our understanding of Johannine style.

3. Conclusion

I began this book by severely criticizing the work done far on the whole issue regarding Johannine style. Although I realize that it is not quite fair to criticize prior scholars from a modern and new paradigm, the fact remains that we could determine the status of and perceptions regarding Johannine style from the examination of previous scholarship, and this proved to be inadequate. As a New Testament scholar I have had to break some new ground in establishing and describing the *status quo* in modern stylistics. Despite the fact that it is not my field of expertise, I could determine that modern stylistics is a very comprehensive and extensive field of research. This meant that I had to make certain choices in deciding which language theory is best suited for a stylistic study of a New Testament text. The choice I exercised is, of course, not final and thus open to correction, but at this stage it does indeed seem that speech act theory has a great deal to offer in terms of describing the vitality and dynamics of the text. In this sense this study was necessary.

Our speech act reading has provided some wonderful new ways of approaching the text of John, but I feel that the chief benefit of our present endeavor is that the analysis proved our initial premise that style does not lie in isolated and single peculiarities of a formal nature. Style has to do with the total communication of the text, carried by a multitude of aspects *in combination*. In this respect, my study differs from previous ones. Since my approach is pragmatic, and not formalist, and since the text we are dealing with is designed to communicate and achieve effects, it is logical that the total communication of the text should be considered. This means that a comprehensive approach, where aspects pertaining to function and formal aspects can both be included, is absolutely necessary. We have found speech act

theory ideally suited for this, as it provides tools for describing style and the function of the text, from both a structural and a poststructural perspective, including the accommodation of the communication between the lines. The implications of this, and the methodologies involved, should be the subject of further study. Of course there are other possible approaches to Johannine style, but I think that one of the important results of this study is that it stresses the need for a more articulate use of the term 'style' in New Testament scholarship. In order to understand, evaluate, and utilize a specific approach to style, both the underlying presuppositions regarding style, and the aim or purpose of the study should be spelled out. This is important, since the perceptions regarding style, and the direction of the specific study would be clear, which would eliminate many misunderstandings and misconceptions.

In this study, speech act theory was applied to the text of John's Gospel in a comprehensive manner for the first time. I have found the application of this theory very stimulating and creative, and I can only hope that other Johannine scholars will join me in this very satisfying way of dealing with the text, and that my rather crude first attempt will be subject to future refinement. Despite the fact that my main object here is the style of John's Gospel, the actual reading of the text has also indicated the promise this methodology holds for understanding the communication of the texts, and for assigning meaning to New Testament texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, E A 1905. *Johannine vocabulary: A comparison of the words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the three*. London: Adam & Charles Black. (Diatessarica V.)
- 1906. *Johannine grammar*. London: Adam & Charles Black. (Diatessarica VI.)
- Abramoski, N A 1972. *A linguistic approach to literature: Three modern Latin American novels*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Abrams, M H 1987. *A glossary of literary terms*. 4th ed. New York: CBS.
- Adams, M W 1895. *St Paul's vocabulary*. Hartford, Conn: Hartford Seminary Press..
- Alexander, N 1979. *The structure of Greek and English: Some problems of translation*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Allis, O T 1928. The alleged Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel. *Princeton Theological Review* 26, 531-582.
- Alter, R 1981. *The art of Biblical narrative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Amante, D J 1981. The theory of ironic speech acts. *Poetics Today* 2, 77-96.
- Arens, E 1982. *Kommunikative Handlungen: Die paradigmatische Bedeutung der Gleichnisse Jesu für eine Handlungstheorie*. Düsseldorf: Patmos.
- Ashton, J W 1960. Foreword, in Sebeok 1960: v-vi.
- Aurelio, T 1977. *Disclosures in den Gleichnissen Jesu. Eine Anwendung der disclosure - Theorie von I T Ramsey, der modernen metaphorik und der Sprechakte auf die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Frankfurt/M: Lang. (Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 8.)
- Austin, J L [1962] 1975. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bach, K & Harnish L M 1979. *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Bailey, R 1967. Current trends in the analysis of style. *Style* 1, 1-14.
- Bal, M 1979. *Mensen van papier*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- 1981. The laughing mice, or: On focalization. *Poetics Today* 2, 202-210.
- 1987. *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen: Inleiding in de narratologie*. 2de uitg. Muiderberg : Coutinho.
- Ball, C J 1909. Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic archetype? *Expository Times* 21, 91-93.
- Ballmer, T & Brennenstuhl, W 1981. *Speech act classification: A study in the lexical analysis of English speech activity verbs*. Berlin: Springer. (Springer Series in Language and Communication 8.)
- Barr, J 1961. *Semantics of Biblical language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, C K 1975. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*. London: SPCK.
- 1978. *The Gospel according to St. John: An introduction with commentary and notes on the Greek text*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK.
- 1982. *Essays on John*. London: SPCK.
- Barthes, R 1971. Style and its image, in Chatman 1971:3-10.
- Bax, M M H 1985. *Oordelen in taal: Semantische en pragmatische aspecten van evaluaties in narratieve communicatie*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof.
- Beardsley, M C 1969. Style and good style, in Love & Payne 1969:3-15.
- Becker, H 1956. *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Becker, J 1969-70. Wunder und Eschatologie: Zum literarkritischen und Christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium. *New Testament Studies* 16, 130-148.
- 1974. Beobachtungen zum Dualismus im Johannesevangelium. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 65, 71-87.
- 1979. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, vol 1 Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn. (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament.)
- 1982. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 47, 279-301; 305-347.
- 1986. Das Johannesevangelium im Streit der Methoden (1980-1984). *Theologische Rundschau* 51, 1-78.
- Bennett, J R 1983. A stylistics check list: IV. *Style* 17, 429-453.

- Bernard, J H 1929. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Beyer, K 1962. *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, vol 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Black, M 1946. *An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Blass, F & Debrunner, A 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature: A translation and revision of the 9th - 10th German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A Debrunner by R W Funk*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bligh, J 1962. Jesus in Samaria. *Heythrop Journal* 3, 329-346.
- Böcher, O 1965. *Der johanneischen Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Boers, H 1980. Discourse structure and macro-structure in the interpretation of texts: Jn 4:1-42 as an example, in Achtemeier P J (ed), *SBL 1980 seminar papers*, 159-182. Chico: Scholars.
- 1988. *Neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem. A study of John 4*. Atlanta: Scholars. (SBL Monograph series 35.)
- Boismard, M É 1958. *L'Évangile de Jean: Études et Problèmes*. Louvain: Desclée de Brouwer.
- 1977. Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: la Wiederaufnahme, in De Jonge 1977:235-241.
- Bonneau, N R 1973. The woman at the well: John 4 and Genesis 24. *Bible Today* 67, 1252-1259.
- Bonsirven, J 1949. Les aramaïsmes de S. Jean l'Évangéliste. *Biblica* 30, 405-432.
- Booth, W 1974. *The rhetoric of irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Botha, J E 1985. 'n Kritiese benadering van die leksikografiese hantering van die betekenisse van pistéuo in die Griekse Nuwe Testament. MA-Thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- 1987. The meanings of pistéuo in the New Testament: A semantic-lexicographical study. *Neotestamentica* 21, 225-240.
- 1990a. Style, the language of the New Testament, and speech act theory. Paper read at the SBL International Meeting, Vienna, 5-8 Aug 1990.
- 1990b. Failure, success, and speech act theory in John 4:1-42: A speech act reading. Paper read at the AAR/SBL National Meeting, New Orleans, 17-20 Nov 1990.
- Bowen, C R 1930. The Fourth Gospel as dramatic material. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49, 292-305.
- Bowman, J 1950. The exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and among the Rabbi's. *Oudtestamentiese Studiën* 8, 230-262.
- 1958. The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40, 298-308.
- Braun, W 1990. Resisting John: Ambivalent redactor and defensive reader of the Fourth Gospel. *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 19, 59-71.
- Bright, W (ed) 1966. *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Brinkman, H 1964. Der Prolog im Mittelalter als literarische Erscheinung. *Wirkendes Wort* 14, 1-21.
- Brogyani, B (ed) 1979. *Studies in diachronic, synchronic, and typological linguistics: Festschrift für Oswald Szemerényi on the occasion of his 65th Birthday*, part 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 11.)
- Broich, U & Pfister, M (Hrsg) 1985. *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistischen Fallstudien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brooke, A E 1912. *The Johannine Epistles*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark (International Critical Commentary.)
- Brooks, C 1947. *The well wrought urn: Studies in the structure of Poetry*. London: Dennis Dobson.
- Brooks, C & Warren, R P 1964. *Understanding Poetry*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Brown, R E 1982. *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols. Rev ed. London: Geoffrey Chapman. (The Anchor Bible.)
- Brown, S 1964. From Burney to Black: The Fourth Gospel and the Aramaic question. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26, 323-339.
- Bruce, F F 1970. *The Epistles of John*. London: Pickering & Inglis.
- Buffon, G L L 1898. *Essai sur l'esthétique de Descartes: Rapports de la doctrine Cartésienne avec la littérature classique Française au XVII siècle*. 2.éd. Paris: sine nomine.
- Bultmann, R [1941] 1957. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. 2.Abt. 15.Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament.)

- Bultmann, R 1959. *Johannesevangelium*, in Galling, K (Hrsg) 1959. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für die Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, vol 3, 840-850. Tübingen: Mohr.
- 1971. *The Gospel of John*, tr by G R Beasley-Murray, ed by R W N Hoare & J K Riches. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burke, K 1970. *The Rhetoric of Religion. Studies in Logology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burney, C F 1922. *Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- 1925. *The Poetry of our Lord*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Burrows, M 1930. The original language of the Gospel of John. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49, 95-139.
- Burton, D 1980. *Dialogue and discourse: A sociolinguistic approach to modern dialogue and naturally occurring conversation*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Buss, M J 1988. Potential and actual interactions between speech act theory and biblical studies. *Semeia* 41, 125-134.
- Cadbury, H J 1920. *The style and literary method of Luke*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cahill, P J 1982. Narrative art in John IV. *Religious Studies Bulletin* 2, 41-55.
- Carmichael, C M 1980. Marriage and the Samaritan woman. *New Testament Studies* 26, 332-346.
- Carson, D A 1982. Understanding misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel. *Tyndale Bulletin* 33, 59-91.
- 1983. Recent literature on the Fourth Gospel: Some reflections. *Themelios* 9, 8-18.
- 1989. Selected recent studies of the Fourth Gospel. *Themelios* 14, 57-64.
- Carter, D 1988. The wild bunch and violence in film. *Foundations and Facets* 4, 54-64.
- Carter, R (ed) 1982. *Language and literature: An introductory reader in stylistics*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Chang Shui-Chi, P 1975. Repetitions and variations in the Gospel of John. PHD Thesis. Strassbourg: Faculté de théologie protestante.
- Chapman, J 1911. *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charles, R H 1963. *The Revelation of St John*, 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Chatman, S (ed & tr) 1971. *Literary style: A symposium*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1978. *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Chomsky, N 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton. (Janua Linguarum 4.)
- Clark, H H & Clark, E V 1977. *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Clavier, H 1959. L'ironie dans le quatrième Evangile, in Aland, K et al (eds) 1959. *Studia Evangelica*, 261-276. Berlin: Akademie.
- Cloete, T T 1984. Taalhandelinge en die literatuur, in: Van Coller & Van Jaarsveld 1984:1-14.
- Cole, P & Morgan, J L (eds) 1975. *Syntax and semantics, vol 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic.
- Colwell, E C 1931. *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel: A study of its Aramaisms in the light of Hellenistic Greek*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Combrink, H J B 1988. Readings, readers and authors: An Orientation. *Neotestamentica* 22, 189-203.
- Combrink, J G H 1987. Noem hom op sy naam. Die nut van die vokatief, in Van Jaarsveld 1987, 15-33.
- Conninck, C M 1948. The dramatic character of the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67, 159-169.
- Conzelmann, H 1967. *Grundriss der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. München: Kaiser.
- Crossan, J D 1983. It is written: A structuralist analysis of John 6. *Semeia* 26, 3-21.
- Culley, R C 1985. Exploring new directions, in Knight, D A & Tucker, G M (eds) 1985. *The Hebrew Bible and its modern interpreters*, 167-200. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Cullmann, O 1948. Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums. *Theologische Zeitschrift* 4, 360-372.
- Culpepper, R A [1983] 1987. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A study in literary design*. Paperback. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Dalman, G 1898. *Die Worte Jesu: Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schriftums und der aramaischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- 1924. *Orte und Wege Jesu*. 3. Aufl. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

- Daube, D 1950. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: SCM.
- Dawsey, J M 1989. The literary unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of style — a task for literary critics. *New Testament Studies* 35, 48-66.
- Deakle, D W 1985. A study of the literary pairs in the Fourth Gospel. PHD thesis. New Orleans: Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Dearing, V A 1959. *A manual of textual analysis*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Deissmann, G A 1907. *New Light on the New Testament from records of the Graeco-Roman period*. tr by L R M Strachan. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- 1910. *Light from the Ancient East*. tr by L R M Strachan. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- De Jonge, M (ed) 1977. *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Leuven: Leuven University Press. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XLIV.)
- Derrett, J D M 1988. The Samaritan Woman's purity (John 4:4-52). *Evangelical Quarterly* 60, 291-298.
- Derrida, J 1979. Living on: Border lines, in Bloom, H *et al* (eds) 1979. *Deconstruction and criticism*, 75-176. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Detweiler, R 1985. What is a sacred text? *Semeia* 31, 213-230.
- Dewey, J 1989. Oral methods of structuring narrative in Mark. *Interpretation* 43, 32-44.
- Dewey, K E 1980. Paroimiai in the Gospel of John. *Semeia* 17, 81-99.
- Diel, P & Solotareff, J 1983. *Le symbolisme dans l'évangile de Jean*. Paris: Payot. (Petite bibliothèque Payot 400.)
- Di Marco, A 1976. Der Chiasmus in der Bibel, 3. Teil (Mat-Jn) *Linguistica Biblica* 39, 37-85.
- Dodd, C H 1953. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- 1958. *The interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- 1963. *Historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dolezel, L & Bailey, R (eds) 1969. *Statistics and style*. New York: American.
- Domeris, W R 1983. The Johannine drama. *Journal of theology for Southern Africa* 42, 29-35.
- Driver, G R 1923. The original language of the Fourth Gospel. *Jewish Guardian* 5 and 12 January.
- Duke, P D 1984. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel: The shape and function of a literary device*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Du Plessis, J G 1985. Clarity and obscurity: A study in textual communication of the relation between sender, parable and receiver in the Synoptic Gospels. DTh Thesis. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- 1988. Why did Peter ask his question and how did Jesus answer him? or: Implicature in Luke 12:35-48. *Neotestamentica* 22, 311-324.
- Du Plessis, T 1987. Dis net 'n grappie! Ironie: 'n perspektief binne die taalhandelings teorie, in Van Jaarsveld 1987:195-215.
- Du Rand, J A 1979. A discourse analysis of 1 John. *Neotestamentica* 13, 1-42.
- 1983. Die Evangelie van Johannes as getuigende vertelling. *Nederduits Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif* 24, 383-397.
- 1984. Die leser in die Evangelie volgens Johannes. *Fax Theologica* 4, 45-63.
- 1985. The characterization of Jesus as depicted in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. *Neotestamentica* 19, 18-36.
- 1986. Plot and point of view in the Gospel of John, in Petzer, J H & Hartin, P J (eds) 1986. *A South African perspective on the New Testament*, 149-169. Leiden: Brill.
- Eastman, R M 1970. *Style: Writing as the discovery of outlook*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Edmondson, W 1981a. Illocutionary verbs, illocutionary acts and conversational behavior, in Eikmeyer, H & Reiser, H (eds) 1981. *Words, worlds and contexts*, 17-31. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 1981b. *Spoken discourse: A model for analysis*. London: Longman.
- Empson, W 1977. *The structure of complex words*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Engelbrecht, E 1987. 'Ken' as deel van die spraakpatroon van die verteller in die Johannesevangelie. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 43, 414-430.
- Enkvist, N E (ed) 1964. *Linguistics and Style*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1985a. Introduction: Stylistics, text linguistics and composition. *Text* 5, 251-267.
- 1985b. Text and discourse linguistics, rhetoric and stylistics, in Van Dijk 1985:11-38.
- Eslinger, L 1987. The wooing of the woman at the well: Jesus the reader and reader-response criticism. *Journal of Literature and theology* 1, 167-183.

- Evans, D A 1981. *Situations and speech acts: Toward a formal semantics of discourse*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Evans, G R 1984. *The language and logic of the Bible: The earlier middle ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Felman, S 1983. *The literary speech act: Don Juan with J L Austin or seduction in two languages*, tr by C Porter. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Fenton, J C 1970. *The Gospel according to John*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Festugière, A J 1974. *Observations Stylistique sur l'Evangile de S. Jean*. Paris: Klincksick.
- Flanagan, N 1981. The Gospel of John as drama. *Bible Today* 19, 264-270.
- Fodor, J D 1980. *Semantics: Theories of meaning in generative grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (The Language and thought series.)
- Fortna, R T 1970. *The Gospel of signs: A reconstruction of the narrative source underlying the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 11).
- Fowler, R 1971. *The languages of literature: Some linguistic contributions to criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1977. *Linguistics and the novel*. London: Methuen.
- 1981. *Literature as social discourse*. London: Batsford.
- Fowler, R M 1981. *Loaves and Fishes: The function of the feeding stories in the Gospel of Mark*. Chico: Scholars Press (SBL dissertation series 54.)
- Frazer, B 1984. The domain of pragmatics, in Richards, J C & Schmidt, R W (eds). *Language and communication*, 29-61. London: Longman.
- Freed, E D 1964. Variations in the language and thought of John. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 55, 167-97.
- Freed, E D & Hunt, R B 1975. Fortna's signs-source in John. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 563-579.
- Freeman, D (ed) 1970. *Linguistics and literary style*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gabel, J B & Wheeler, C B 1986. *The Bible as literature: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gächter, P 1934. Der Formale Aufbau der Abschiedsrede Jesu. *Zeitschrift für Katolische Theologie* 58, 155-207.
- 1935. Die Form der eucharistischen Rede Jesu (Jn 6:35ff). *Zeitschrift für Katolische Theologie* 59, 419-441.
- 1936. Strophen im Johannesevangelium. *Zeitschrift für Katolische Theologie* 60, 99-120; 402-423.
- Geyser, A S 1956. Israel in the Fourth Gospel. *Neotestamentica* 2, 13-20.
- Giblin, C H 1983. The miraculous crossing of the sea (John 6:16-21). *New Testament Studies* 29, 96-103.
- Gignac, F T 1977. Book review of Turner, N 1976. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39, 165-167.
- Gilleland, M E 1980. Female speech in Greek and Latin. *American Journal of Philology* 101, 180-183.
- Givon, T 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic.
- Gloversmith, F (ed) 1984. *The theory of reading*. Sussex: Harvester.
- Goodspeed, E J 1912. The vocabulary of Luke and Acts. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 31, 92-114.
- 1937. The original language of the New Testament, in *New Chapters in New Testament Study*, 127-168. New York: McMillan.
- Grice, H P 1975a. Logic and Conversation in Cole & Morgan 1975:41-58.
- 1975b. Logica en gesprek, tr by M A van Hoft-Rees, in Van Eemeren & Koning 1981:235-255.
- Gordon, D & Lakoff, G 1971. Conversational postulates, in Adams, D (ed) 1971. *Papers from the seventh regional meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 41-58. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Gunderson, K 1975. *Language, mind and knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis.
- Haas, C, De Jonge, M & Swellengrebel, J L 1972. *A translators handbook on the letters of John*. London: United Bible Societies.
- Haenchen, E 1955. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 23, 295-335.
- 1980. *Johannesevangelium: Ein Kommentar*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Halliday, M A K 1964. Descriptive linguistics in literary studies, in Freeman 1970:57-72.

- Halliday, M A K 1970. Language structure and language function in Lyons, J (ed) 1970. *New horizons in linguistics*, 140-65. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 1978. *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hancher, M 1979. The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 8, 1-14.
- 1988. Performative utterance, the Word of God, and the death of the author. *Semeia* 41, 27-40.
- Harley, L 1987. Wolf Schmid se kommunikasiemodel as basis vir die dualiteitsbegrip: Abstrakte outeur as wesens en digterpersoonlikheid. *Journal of Literary Studies* 3, 60-70.
- Harner, P B 1970. *The "I am" of the Fourth Gospel: A study in Johannine usage and thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Harris, Z S 1951. *Methods in structural linguistics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Hartin, P J 1985. A community in crisis. The christology of the Johannine community as the point at issue. *Neotestamentica* 19, 37-49.
- Hartman, L & Olsson, B (eds) 1987. *Aspects on the Johannine literature. Papers presented at a conference of Scandinavian New Testament exegetes at Uppsala June 18-19, 1986*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International. (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 18 Collectanea)
- Harty, E R 1985. Text, context, and intertext. *Journal of Literary Studies* 1, 1-13.
- Hasel, G F 1982. *New Testament Theology: Basic issues in the current debate*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hatch, E. 1889. *Essays in biblical Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, D A 1917. *John and his writings*. New York: the Methodist Book Concern.
- Heil, J P 1989. Reader-response and the irony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:66-71. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51, 271-284.
- Henaut, B W 1990. John 4:43-54 and the ambivalent narrator: A response to Culpeper's *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 19, 287-304.
- Hendriksen, W 1976. *The Gospel of John*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth. (New Testament Commentary.)
- Hewitt, J P & Stokes, R 1975. Disclaimers. *American Sociological Review* 40, 1-11.
- Hirsch, E 1950-51. Stilkritik und Literaranalyse im vierten Evangelium. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 43, 128-143.
- Holtzmann, H J & Baur, W 1908. *Johannesbriefe*. Tübingen: Mohr. (Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament IV, 23.)
- Holub, R C 1984. *Reception Theory: A critical introduction*. London: Methuen. (New Accents.)
- Horner, W B 1975. *Text act theory: A study of nonfiction texts*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Hoskyns, E C 1940. *The Fourth Gospel*. ed by F N Davey. London: Faber & Faber.
- Howard, W F 1929. Semitisms in the New Testament, in Moulton, J H and Howard, W F (ed). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol 2, 483-484. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- 1947. The common authorship of the Joh. Gospel and Epistles. *Journal of Theological Studies* 48, 12-25.
- 1955. *The Fourth Gospel in recent criticism and interpretation*. 4th rev ed. London: Epworth.
- Huddleston, R O 1976. *An introduction to transformational syntax*. London: Longman.
- Hudson, R A 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, P E 1976-77. Book review of Turner, N 1976. *Westminster Theological Journal* 39, 152-155.
- Hurford, J R & Heasley, B 1983. *Semantics: A coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iser, W 1978. *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.
- 1980. Interaction between text and reader, in Sulciman & Crosman 1980:106-119.
- Jacobs, L D 1985. Taalhandelinge en strategieë in 1 Korinthiërs 1-4. MA thesis, Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Free State.
- Jansen, H L 1948. Typology in the Gospel according to John, in Borgen, P (ed) 1985. *The many and the one: Essays on religion in the Greco Roman world presented to Herman Ludin Jansen on his 80th birthday*, 125-143. Trondheim: Tapir.
- Jauss, H R 1982. *Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics*. tr by M Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Jefferson, A 1987. Structuralism and post structuralism, in Jefferson & Robey 1987:92-121.
- Jefferson, A & Robey, D (eds) 1987. *Modern literary theory: A comparative introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Batsford.
- Jenkinson, A G 1987. Aspekte van voornaamwoorde en verwysing in taalhandelinge, in Van Jaarsveld 1987: 51-74.
- Jeremias, J 1941. Johanneische Literarkritik. *Theologische Blätter* 20, 33-46.
- Johnson, A M 1978. *The cultural context of the Gospel of John: A structural approach*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Jónsson, J 1965. *Humour and irony in the New Testament: Illuminated by parallels in talmud and Midrash*. Reykjavik: Bókaútgáfa Menningarsjóds.
- Jülicher, A 1904. *An introduction to the New Testament*. New York: G P Putnam's Sons.
- Kaufer, D S 1981. Understanding ironic communication. *Journal of Pragmatics* 5, 495-510.
- Käsemann, E 1942-46. Book review of Bultmann, R 1941. *Verkündigung und Forschung* 3, 182-201.
- Kearns, J T 1984. *Using language and the structures of speech acts*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Kennedy, H A A 1895. *Sources of New Testament Greek or the influence of the Septuagint on the vocabulary of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Kenney, A 1986. *A Stylometric study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kilian, J 1989. *Form and style in theological texts: A guide for the use of the Harvard Reference System*. 2nd rev ed. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Kilpatrick, G D 1960. Some notes on Johannine usage. *The Bible Translator* 11, 173-177.
- 1961. Two Johannine idioms in the Johannine Epistles. *Journal of Theological Studies* 12, 272-273.
- 1988. Book review of Kenney, A 1986. *Novum Testamentum* 30, 373-375.
- 1990. Two studies of style and text in the Greek New Testament. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 41, 94-98.
- Kippenberg, H G 1971. *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kotze, P P A 1985. John and reader's response. *Neotestamentica* 19, 50-63.
- Ironie in die Johannesevangelie. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 43, 431-447.
- Krenkel, M 1894. *Josephus und Lucas: Der Schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtsschreibers auf den Christlichen nachgewiesen*. Leipzig: Haessel.
- Kriek, H S 1988. 'n Resepsie-estetiese ondersoek na Spreuke sewe. MA Thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Kümmel, W G 1970. *Das Neue Testament im 20. Jahrhundert: Ein Forschungsbericht*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 50.)
- Kundsin, K 1939. Character und Ursprung der Johanneischen Reden. *Latvijas Universitātes Raksti* 1, 185-301.
- Kysar, R 1975. *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An examination of contemporary scholarship*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- 1976. *John, the Maverick Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- 1983. The Gospel of John in current research. *Religious Studies Review* 9, 314-323.
- 1984. *John's story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Labuschagne, C J 1987. De numerieke struktuuranalise van de bijbelse geskrifte. *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 41, 1-16.
- Lagrange, M J 1936. *Evangile selon Saint Jean*. Paris: Lecoffre.
- Lanigan, R L 1977. *Speech act phenomenology*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Lanser, S S 1981. *The narrative act: Point of view in prose fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 1988. (Feminist) criticism in the garden: Inferring Genesis 2-3. *Semeia* 41, 67-84.
- Lategan, B C 1985. Reference: Reception, Redescription and Reality, in Lategan & Vorster 1985:67-93.
- 1987. Reader clues in the text of Galatians. *Journal of Literary Studies* 3, 47-59.
- Lategan, B C & Vorster W S (eds) 1985. *Text and reality: Aspects of reference in Biblical texts*. Atlanta: Scholars.
- Lawrence, I 1980. *Linguistics and Theology: The significance of Noam Chomsky for theological construction*. London: Scarecrow and the American Theological Library Association.
- Leavis, F R 1948. *The great tradition*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- 1952. *The common pursuit*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Leech, G N 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- 1985. Stylistics, in Van Dijk 1985:39-57.
- Leech, G N & Short, M 1981. *Style in fiction*. London: Longman.
- Leidig, E 1979. *Jesu Gespräch mit der Samaritanerin und weitere Gespräche im Johannesevangelium*. Basel: Reinhardt. (Theologische Dissertationen 15.)
- Léon-Dufour, X 1960. Trois chiasmes johanniques. *New Testament Studies* 7, 249-255.
- 1981. Towards a symbolic reading of the Fourth Gospel. *New Testament Studies* 27, 439-456.
- Leroy, H 1968a. *Rätsel und Misverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein.
- 1968b. Das johanneische Misverständnis als literarische Form. *Bibel und Leben* 9, 196-207.
- Levin, S R 1977. *The Semantics of metaphor*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.
- Levinson, S C 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, R H 1963. *St. John's Gospel: A commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindars, B 1972. *The Gospel of John*. London: Oliphant (New Century Bible.)
- Loader, W G R 1984. The central structure of Johannine Christology. *New Testament Studies* 30, 188-216.
- Lode, L 1983. Narrative paragraphs in the Gospels and Acts. *Bible Translator* 34, 322-335.
- Lombard, H A 1987. John's Gospel and the Johannine Church: A mirror of events within a text or/and a window on events within a church. *Hervormde Theologiese Studies* 43, 395-413.
- Longacre, R E 1985. Interpreting biblical Stories, in Van Dijk 1985: 169-85.
- Lotman, Y M & Piatigorsky, A M 1977-78. Text and Function. *New Literary History* 9, 233-244.
- Louw, J P 1971. Verbale aspek in Grieks. *Taalfasette* 15, 13-26.
- 1986. On Johannine Style. *Neotestamentica* 20, 5-12.
- 1989. Die uur van die kruisiging en dagrekening in die antieke. *Scriptura* 29, 13-18.
- Louw, J P & Nida, E A (eds) 1988. *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains*, 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Love, G A & Payne, M (eds) 1969. *Contemporary essays on style: Rhetoric, linguistics and criticism*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman.
- Lucas, F L 1974. *Style*. London: Cassell.
- Lyons, J 1983. *Semantics*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1985. *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McConnell, F (ed) 1986. *The Bible and the narrative tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacDonald, J 1964. *The theology of the Samaritans*. London: SCM.
- McKay, K L 1981. On the perfect and other aspects in New Testament Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 23, 289-329.
- 1985. Style and significance in the language of John 21:15-17. *Novum Testamentum* 27, 319-333.
- McLaughlin, M L 1984. *Conversation: How talk is organized*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Maclean, I 1987. Reading and interpretation, in Jefferson & Robey 1987:122-144.
- McPolin, J 1980. Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Some contemporary trends. *Irish Biblical Studies* 2, 3-26.
- MacRae, G W 1973. Theology and irony in the Fourth Gospel, in Clifford, R J & MacRae, G W (eds) 1973. *The Word in the world: Essays in honor of F L Moriarty*, 83-96. Cambridge, Mass: Weston College.
- Mair, C 1985. The "New Stylistics": A success story or the story of successful self deception? *Style* 19, 117-33.
- Malatesta, E 1967. *St. John's Gospel 1920-1965: A cumulative and classified bibliography of books and periodical literature on the Fourth Gospel*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Manson, T W 1947. Book review of Black, M 1946. *Journal of Theological Studies* 48, 219-221.
- 1963. *On Paul and John: Some selected theological themes*. Naperville: SCM.
- Martyn, J L 1970. Source Criticism and Religionsgeschichte in the Fourth Gospel. *Perspective* 2, 247-273.
- Matera, F J 1988. The prologue as the interpretative key to Mark's Gospel. *Journal for the study of the New Testament* 34, 3-20.
- Meeks, W A 1967. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden: Brill. (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 14)
- Menken, M J J 1985. *Numerical literary techniques in John. The Fourth Evangelist's use of numbers of words and syllables*. Leiden: Brill (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 55)

- Menoud, Ph-H 1947. *L'Evangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes*. 2nd ed. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé. (Cahiers théologiques de l'actualité protestante 3.)
- Miller, O 1985. Intertextual identity, in Valdés, M J & Miller, O (eds) 1985. *Identity of the literary text*, 3-15. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Miner, P S 1983. The original functions of John 21. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, 85-98.
- Mrakuzhyil, G 1987. *The Christocentric literary structure of the Fourth Gospel*. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico. (Analecta Biblica 117.)
- Moloney, F J 1990. Reading John 2: 13-22: The purification of the temple. *Revue Biblique* 97, 432-452.
- Montgomery, J A 1923. *The Origin of the Gospel according to St. John*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Morris, L 1969. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Exeter: Paternoster.
- 1981. *The Gospel according to John: The English text with introduction, exposition and notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (New International Commentary on the New Testament.)
- Morton, A Q & Michaelson, S 1974. *A critical concordance to the Gospel of John*. Sine loco: Biblical Research Associates. (The Computer Bible vol 5.)
- Moule, C F D 1959. *An Idiom: Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muecke, D C 1969. *The compass of irony*. London: Methuen.
- Muilenburg, J 1932. Literary form in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51, 40-53.
- Munz, J M 1978. *Beginning Semantics*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Nauck, W 1957. *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Navone, J 1985. *Gospel of love: A narrative theology*. Wilmington: Glazier. (Good News Studies 12.)
- Neirynck, F 1980. L'épanalepsis et la critique littéraire: A propos de l'Evangile de Jean. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 56, 303-338.
- Neufeld, D 1990. A speech act analysis of the Incipit of 1 John (1:1-4). Paper read at the AAR/SBL National Meeting, New Orleans, 17-20 Nov 1990.
- Newman, B M 1975. Some observations regarding the argument, structure and literary characteristics of the Gospel of John. *Bible Translator* 26, 234-239.
- Neyrey, J H 1979. Jacob traditions and the interpretation of John 4:10-26. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41, 419-437.
- Nicol, W 1972a. *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and redaction*. Leiden: Brill. (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 32.)
- 1972b. The history of Johannine research during the past century. *Neotestamentica* 6, 8-18.
- Nida, E A 1975. *Componential analysis of meaning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1982. Rhetoric and the translator: With special reference to John 1. *Bible Translator* 33, 324-328.
- Nida, E A, Louw, J P, Snyman, A H & Cronje, J v W 1983. *Style and discourse: With special reference to the text of the Greek New Testament*. Cape Town: Bible Society.
- Nieting, L 1977. Book review of Turner, N 1976. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, 591-592.
- Norden, E [1913] 1956. *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte Religiöser Rede*. 4. Aufl. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Nortjé, S J 1986. The role of women in the Fourth Gospel. *Neotestamentica* 20, 21-28.
- O'Day, G R 1986. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative mode and theological claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- O'Grady, J F 1982. Recent developments in Johannine Studies. *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 12, 54-58.
- Ohlhoff, H 1984. Proloog, perlokusie, illokusie, in: Van Collier & Van Jaarsveld 1984:61-73.
- Ohman, R 1964. Generative grammars and the concept of literary style. *Word* 20, 423-439.
- Okure, T 1988. *The Johannine approach to mission. A contextual study of John 4:1-42*. Tübingen: Mohr. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/31.)
- Olsson, B 1974. *Structure and meaning in the Fourth Gospel*. Uppsala: Lund. (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 6.)
- 1985. A Decade of text-linguistic analyses of biblical texts at Uppsala. *Studia Theologica* 39, 107-126.
- O'Rourke, J J 1979. Asides in the Gospel of John. *Novum Testamentum* 21, 210-9.
- Pamment, M 1985. Path and residence metaphors in the Fourth Gospel. *Theology* 88, 118-124.
- Patte, D 1988. Speech act theory and biblical exegesis. *Semeia* 41, 85-102.

- Pazdan, M M 1987. Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman: Contrasting models of discipleship. *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 17, 145-148.
- Petersen, N R 1978. *Literary criticism for New Testament critics*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- 1984. The reader in the Gospel. *Neotestamentica* 18, 38-51.
- Phillips, G A 1983. 'This is a hard saying. Who can be a listener to it?': Creating a reader in John 6. *Semeia* 26, 23-56.
- Platt, J T & Platt, H K 1975. *The social significance of speech: An introduction to and workbook in sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: North Holland. (North Holland Linguistic Series 23.)
- Polanyi, L 1981. On telling the same story twice. *Text* 1, 315-336.
- 1982. Linguistic and social constraints on storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics* 6, 509-524.
- Ponelis, F A 1979. *Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Poythress, V A 1984a. The use of intersentence conjunctions DE, OUN, KAI and asyndeton in the Gospel of John. *Novum Testamentum* 26, 312-340.
- 1984b. Testing for Johannine Authorship by examining the use of conjunctions. *Westminster Theological Journal* 46, 350-369.
- 1985. Johannine authorship and the use of intersentence conjunctions in the book of Revelation. *Westminster Theological Journal* 47, 329-336.
- Pratt, M L 1977. *Towards a speech act theory of literary discourse*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Propp, V 1926. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Rabinowitz, I 1982. New criticism: Beloved infidel, in Ryan & Van Zyl 1982:24-40.
- Rainer, W (ed) 1975. *Receptionsästhetik: Theorie und praxis*. Munich: Fink.
- Ransom, J C 1941. *The new criticism*. Norfolk, Conn: New Directions.
- Rau, C 1972. *Struktur und Rhythmus in Johannes-Evangelium*. Stuttgart: Urachhaus.
- Reinhartz, A 1989. Great expectations: a reader-oriented approach to johannine christology and eschatology. *Journal of literature and Theology* 3, 61-76.
- Reiser, M 1984. *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Licht der Hellenistischen Volksliteratur*. Tübingen: Mohr (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/11.)
- Rensberger, D 1984. The politics of John: The trail of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103, 395-411.
- Resseguie, J L 1984. Reader's-response criticism and the Synoptic Gospels. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 52, 307-324.
- Retief, R 1984. *Bevraging*. PhD-Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- 1987a. Ek aanvaar/verag/objekteer/blameer ... maar moet verskill! in Van Jaarsveld 1987:75-93.
- 1987b. Insinuer jy miskien of skimp jy dalk ...? in Van Jaarsveld 1987:139-156.
- Richard, E 1985. Expressions of double meaning and their function in the Gospel of John. *New Testament Studies* 31, 96-112.
- Richards, I A 1924. *Principles of literary criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Richards, I A & Empson, W 1929. *Practical criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Richards, K H (ed) 1983. *SBL 1983 seminar papers*. Chico: Scholars.
- Ricoeur, P 1973. The model of text: Meaningful action considered as a text. *New Literary History* 5, 91-117.
- Ridderbos, H N 1966. The structure and scope of the prologue to the Gospel of John. *Novum Testamentum* 8, 188-201.
- Riffaterre, M 1978. *Semiotics of poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S 1983. *Narrative fiction: Contemporary poetics*. London: Methuen.
- Robertson, A T 1923. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*. 4th ed. New York: Broadman.
- Robey, D 1987. Anglo-American New Criticism, in Jefferson & Robey 1987:73-91.
- Rowley, H H 1947. Book review of Black, M 1946. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 4, 35-36.
- Roy, A M 1981. The function of irony in discourse. *Text* 1, 407-423.
- Ruckstuhl, E 1951. *Die Literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums: Der Gegenwärtige Stand der Einschlägigen Forschung*. Freiburg: Paulus.
- 1977. Johannine language and style: The question of their unity, in De Jonge, M 1977:125-147.
- Ryan, R 1985. Pathologies of epistemology in literary studies. *Journal of Literary Studies* 1, 3-42.
- Ryan, R & Van Zyl S (eds) 1982. *An introduction to contemporary literary theory*. Johannesburg: Donker.

- Salom, A P 1955. Some aspects of the grammatical style of 1 John. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, 96-102.
- Salmon, G 1885. *A historical introduction to the study of the books of the New Testament*. London: John Murray.
- Saussure, F de [1916] 1974. *Course in general Linguistics*, ed by C Bally & A Sedenaye; tr by W Boston. London: Peter Owen.
- Schiffrin, D 1981. Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57, 45-62.
- 1984. How a story says what it means and does. *Text* 4, 313-346.
- Schlatter, A 1902. *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- Schleghoff, E.A. 1973. Recycled turn beginnings: A precise rapid mechanism in conversation turn taking organization. Public lecture in the series "Language in the context of Space, Time and Society", Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of Michigan July 1973. Mimeographed.
- Schmid, W 1973. *Der Textaufbau in der Erzählungen Dostoevskijs*. Munich: Fink.
- Schmidt, D D 1990. Prospects for writing a new Blass-Debrunner-Funk. Paper read at the SBL International Meeting, Vienna, 5-8 Aug 1990.
- Schnackenburg, R 1963. *Die Johannesbriefe*. Freiburg: Herder. (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.)
- 1965. *Das Johannesevangelium*. 1. Teil. Freiburg: Herder. (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.)
- 1968. *The Gospel according to St. John*, vol 1. New York: Herder. (Herders Theological Commentary to the New Testament.)
- 1971. *Das Johannesevangelium*, bd 2. Freiburg: Herder. (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.)
- 1977. Entwicklung und Stand der Johanneischen Forschung seit 1955, in De Jonge 1977:19-44.
- 1983. Aus der Johanneischen Forschung. *Biblistische Zeitschrift* 27, 281-287.
- Schneiders, S M 1977. History and symbolism in the Fourth Gospel, in De Jonge 1977:371-376.
- Scholes, R & Kellogg, R 1966. *The nature of narrative*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Schulz, S 1960. *Komposition und Herkunft der Johanneischen Reden*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Schweizer, E 1939. *Ego Eimi: Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der Johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Scobie, C H 1976-1977. New directions in the study of the Fourth Gospel. *Studies in Religion* 6, 185-193.
- Searle, J R 1975. A taxonomy of illocutionary acts, in Gunderson 1975:344-369.
- 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5, 1-23.
- [1969] 1977. *Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Paperback. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle J R, Kiefer, F & Bierwisch, M (eds) 1980. *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Sebeok, T A (ed) 1960. *Style in language*. Cambridge: MIT
- Segers, R T (ed) 1979. *Receptie - Esthetica, Grondslagen, Theorie & Toepassing*. Amsterdam: Huis aan het drie grachten.
- Seim, T K 1987. Roles of women in the Gospel of John, in Hartman & Olsson 1987:56-73.
- Sidgwick, A 1907. On some forms of irony in literature. *Cornhill Magazine* 22, 497-508.
- Silva, M 1980. Bilingualism and the character of Palestinian Greek. *Biblica* 61, 198-219.
- 1983. *Biblical words and their meanings: An introduction to lexical semantics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Simcox, W H 1889. *The language of the New Testament*. New York: Whittaker.
- Smalley, S S 1978. *John, evangelist and interpreter*. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Smith, B 1984. Ten conditions on a theory of speech acts. *Theoretical Linguistics* 11, 311-330.
- Smith, D M 1965. *The composition and order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's literary theory*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Smith, D M 1976. *John*. Philadelphia: Fortress. (Proclamation Commentaries).
- 1980. Book review of Barrett, C K 1978. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, 626-627.
- 1984. *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its setting sources, and theology*. Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Smith, R H 1981. Books worth discussing. *Currents in Theology and Mission* 8, 41-44.
- Smit Sibinga J 1970. *Literair handwerk in Handelingen*. Leiden: Brill.

- Snyman, A H 1983. Vrae, vraagstellings en vraagapêlle in die Nuwe Afrikaanse Vertaling van 1 Korinthiërs, in Van Rensburg M C J (red) 1983, *Kongresreferate by die 19e Nasionale Kongres van die Linguistevereniging van Suider Afrika*. Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Free State.
- Snyman, G F 1988. Die wonders in Johannes 6 verklaar aan die hand van 'n vertellersperspektiefanalise. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 44, 708-733.
- Snyman, H 1982. "Die buffel van die metafisika": Taalhandelinge as paradoks, in Van Jaarsveld 1982: 201-202.
- Staley, J L 1986a. *The print's first kiss: A rhetorical investigation of the implied reader in the Fourth Gospel*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- 1986b. The structure of John's prologue: its implications for the Gospel's narrative structure. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48, 241-264.
- Stanford, W D 1972. *Ambiguity in Greek literature: Studies in theory and practice*. London: Johnson.
- Stankiewicz, E 1960. Expressive language, in Sebeok 1960:96-97.
- Stemberger, G 1970. *La symbolique du bien et du mal selon saint Jean*. Tr par C Péquinet & H Schmid. Paris: Seuil.
- Sternberg, M 1987. *The poetics of biblical narrative: Ideological literature and the drama of reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Stiles, W B 1981. Classification of intersubjective illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 10, 227-249.
- Stolt B 1975. Rezension: Birger Olsson, Structure and meaning in the Fourth Gospel. A text-linguistic analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42. *Linguistica Biblica* 34-35, 110-123.
- Strachan, R H 1925. *The Fourth Evangelist*. New York: Doran.
- Strawson, P F 1964. Intention and convention in speech acts. *Philosophical Review* 73, 439-460.
- Stubbs, M 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sturch, R L 1977-78. Jeremias and John: Parables in the Fourth Gospel. *Expository Times* 89, 235-238.
- Suleiman, S R & Crosman, I (eds) 1980. *The Reader in the text: Essays on audience and interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Talbert, C H 1970. Artists and theology: An analysis of the architecture of Jn 1.19-5.47. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32, 341-366.
- Taylor, V 1946-47. Book review of Black, M 1946. *Expository Times* 58, 147.
- Teeple, H M 1974. *The literary origin of the Gospel of John*. Evanston: Religion and Ethics Institute.
- Tenney, M C 1960. The footnotes of John's Gospel. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 117, 350-364.
- Terblanche, C J J 1987. Gapastheidsvoorwaardes om direkte taalhandelinge te onderskei, in Van Jaarsveld 1987:125-137.
- Thistleton, A C 1970. The parables as language-event: Some comments on Fuch's hermeneutics in the light of linguistic philosophy. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23, 437-468.
- Thyen, H 1974. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 39, 1-69; 222-252; 289-330.
- 1977. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 42, 211-270.
- 1978. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 43, 328-359.
- 1979. Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium. *Theologische Rundschau* 44, 97-134.
- Tilley, T 1985. Story theology. Wilmington: Glazier (Good News Studies.)
- Todorov, T 1971. The place of style in the structure of the text, in Chatman 1971:29-44.
- Topel, L J 1971. A note on the methodology of structural analysis in Jn 2:23-3:21. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, 211-220.
- Torrey, C C 1923. The Aramaic origin of the Gospel of John. *Harvard Theological Review* 16, 305-344.
- 1933. *The Four Gospels*. New York: Harper.
- 1936. *Our Translated Gospels*. New York: Harper.
- Trager, G L & Smith, H L 1951. *An outline of English structure*. Washington: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Tragan, P 1980. Els discurs parablics del quart evangeli. *Qüestions de Vida Cristiana* 104, 64-83.
- Traugott, E 1973. Generative semantics and the concept of literary discourse. *Journal of Literary semantics* 2, 5-22.
- Trudinger, P 1971. Subtle word-plays in the Gospel of John and the problem of Chapter 21. *Journal of Religious Thought* 28, 27-31.

- Turner, G W 1973. *Stylistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Turner, N 1976. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek by J H Moulton, vol 4: Style*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Ullmann, S 1964. *Language and Style*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Aarde, A G 1989. Resonance and reception: Interpreting Mt 17:24-27 in context. *Scriptura* 29, 1-12.
- Van Belle, G 1985. *Les Parenthèses dans l'Evangile de Jean. Aperçu historique et classification texte Grec de Jean*. Leuven: Peeters. (Studium Novi Testamenti: Auxilia 11.)
- 1988. *Johannine Bibliography 1966-1985: A cumulative bibliography on the Fourth Gospel*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Van Coller, H P & Van Jaarsveld, G J (eds) 1984. *Woorde as dade: Taalhandelinge en letterkunde*. Durban: Butterworth.
- Van Coller, H P & Van Rensburg, M C J 1984. Suggesties, implikasies en afleidings, in Van Coller & Van Jaarsveld 1984:86-98.
- Van Dijk, T A 1972. *Some aspects of text grammars*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1974-75. Action, action description, and narrative. *New Literary History* 6, 273-294.
- (ed) 1985. *Discourse and literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Dijk T A & Kintsch, W 1983. *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic.
- Van Eemeren, F H & Koning, W K B (reds) 1981. *Studies over taalhandelinge*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Van Halsema, J H 1983. Het raadsel als litteraire vorm in Marcus en Johannes. *Gereformeerd theologisch tijdschrift* 83, 1-17.
- Van Jaarsveld, G J (red) 1982. *Wat sê jy? Studies oor taalhandelinge in Afrikaans*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.
- (red) 1987. *Wat bedoel jy? Pretoria: Serva*.
- Verdoodt, A (ed) 1974. *Proceedings. Volume II: Applied Sociolinguistics*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos. (Association internationale de linguistique appliquee. Third Congress, Copenhagen 1972).
- Von Wahlde, U C 1976. A redactional technique in the Fourth Gospel. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38, 520-533.
- 1984. Literary structure and theological argument in three discourses with the Jews in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103, 575-584.
- Vorster, W S 1972. The Gospel of John as language. *Neotestamentica* 6, 19-27.
- 1986. The New Testament and narratology. *Journal of Literary Studies* 2, 52-61.
- 1987. Op weg na 'n post-kritiese Nuwe-Testamentiese wetenskap. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 43, 374-394.
- 1988a. The Protevangelium of James and intertextuality, in Baarda, T et al (eds) 1988. *Text and testimony: Essays in honour of A F J Kleijn*, 262-275. Kampen: Kok.
- 1988b. Oor lees, lesers en Johannes 4, in De Villiers, P G R (red) 1988. *Hoe lees'n mens die Bybel?* 1-30. Pretoria: Universiteit van Suid-Afrika.
- Wagner, G 1975. *An exegetical bibliography on the Gospel of John*. Rüslikon-Zürich: Baptist Theological Siminary (Bibliographical Aids 8).
- Walker, N 1960. The reckoning of the hours in the Fourth Gospel. *Novum Testamentum* 4, 69 - 73.
- Watson, N 1988. Reception theory and biblical exegesis. *Australian Biblical Review* 36, 45-56.
- Wead, D W 1970. *The literary devices in John's Gospel*. Basel: Reinhardt. (Theologische Dissertationen 4.)
- Weathers, W 1964. The rhetoric of the series, in Love & Payne 1964:21-27.
- Weideman, A J 1988. *Linguistics: A crash course for students*. Rev ed. Bloemfontein: Patmos.
- Welch, J W 1981. Il chiasmo del Nuovo Testamento, in *Chiasmus in antiquity: Structures, analyses, exegesis*. Hidesheim: Gerstenberg, 211-249.
- Welleck, R & Warren, A [1942] 1973. *Theory of literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Wendland, E R 1985. *Language, society and Bible translation. With special reference to the style and structure of segments of direct speech in the Scriptures*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.
- Westcott, B F 1892. *The Epistles of St. John*. Cambridge: MacMillan.
- 1954. *The Gospel according to Saint John: The Greek text with introduction and notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Wetter, G P 1916. *'Der Sohn Gottes': Eine Untersuchung über den Character und die Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums; zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Heilandsgestalten der Antike.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- White, H C 1988. Speech act theory and literary criticism. *Semeia* 41, 1-24.
- Widdowson, H G 1975. *Stylistics and the teaching of literature.* London: Longman.
- Wierzbicka, A 1980. *Lingua Mentalis: The semantics of natural language.* Sydney: Academic.
- Wilder, A N 1971. *Early Christian rhetoric: The language of the Gospel.* Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Willemse, J 1965. *Het vierde evangelie: Een onderzoek naar zijn structuur.* Antwerpen: Wijmegen.
- Wilson, W G 1948. An examination of the linguistic evidence adduced against the unity of authorship of the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Theological Studies* 49, 147-156.
- Wimsatt, W K 1954. *The verbal icon: Studies in the meaning of poetry.* Lexington: Kentucky University.
- Windisch, H 1923. Die Johanneische Erzählungstil, in *Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Festschrift für H Gunkel*, vol II, 174-213. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Winer, G B 1822. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese.* Leipzig: Vogel.
- Wolfson, N 1976. Speech events and natural speech: Some implications for sociolinguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 5, 189-209.
- Wrede, D W 1933. *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums.* 2. Aufl. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Wuellner, W 1981. Narrative criticism and the Lazarus Story. A paper presented at the seminar on 'Symbols Metaphors and Models in the New Testament' of the 36th meeting of the Society for New Testament Studies, Rome 1981.
- Wybenga, D M 1984. Aanspreekvorme: Sisteem of boodskap. *SA Tydskrif vir Taalkunde* 2, 79-89.
- Zerwick, M 1963. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by examples, English edition adapted from the 4th Latin edition by J. Smith.* Rome: Biblical Institute.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND SOURCES

- Abbott, E A 4-16, 24, 25, 30, 114
 Abrams, M H 45, 46, 48, 49
 Adams, M W 3
 affirmative 148, 164, 173
 Allis, O T 26
 Alter, R 111
 Amante, D J 130
 American New Criticism 44
 American structuralism 43
 approbation maxim 70, 142, 143
 appropriateness conditions 66-68, 75, 77, 78,
 79-81, 85-87, 92, 93, 116, 118, 125, 196
 Aramaic 2, 11, 25, 26, 27, 28
 Aramaisms 12, 25, 26, 27, 31
 Arens, E 63
 Ashton, J W 43
 asides 34, 89, 99, 192
 assertion 73, 99, 119, 125, 123, 184
 assertive 136, 137, 143, 147, 148, 152, 156, 157,
 158, 159, 166, 170, 174, 180, 181, 187
 attentio 91, 99, 102
 Aurelio, T 63
 Austin, J L 47, 62, 64, 65, 79, 83, 84
- Bach, K & Harnish L M 65, 66, 70, 71, 76, 84,
 99, 130, 147, 152, 174
 Bailey, R 43
 Bal, M 75
 Ball, C J 25
 Barr, J 47
 Barrett, C K 9, 10, 11, 13, 27, 34, 36, 100, 117,
 124, 143, 144, 147, 150, 160, 168, 173-
 175
 Barthes, R 50
 Bax, M M H 76
 Beardsley, M C 49
 Becker, H 17, 20, 21,
 Becker, J 1, 33, 36
 benevolentio 91, 92
 Bennett 42, 43, 50
 Bernard, J H 139
 betrothal scene 111, 113, 139, 183
 Beyer, K 27
 Black, M 26
- Bligh, J 111, 142
 Böcher, O 36
 Boers, H 38, 96, 103, 106, 109, 111, 115, 163,
 164, 169, 170, 172, 175
 Boismard, M É 26, 36
 Bonneau, N R 111
 Bonsirven, J 26
 Booth, W 118, 129
 Botha, J E 63
 Bowen, C R 33
 Bowman, J 107
 Braun, W 82
 Brinkman, H 91
 Broich, U & Pfister, M 113
 Brooke, A E 29
 Brooks, C 44
 Brooks, C & Warren, R P 44
 Brown, R E 9-11, 34, 90, 92, 100, 103, 117,
 124, 142-144, 147, 148, 150, 153, 160,
 171, 173-175
 Brown, S 27, 28,
 Bultmann, R 12-18, 20, 21, 34, 89, 92, 103,
 124, 142, 145, 148, 150, 168, 172-175
 Burney, C F 25, 26, 27, 34
 Burrows, M 26
- Cadbury, H J 3
 Cahill, P J 37, 111, 124, 150
 Carmichael, C M 108, 111, 138, 139, 142, 144,
 150, 151, 171
 Carson, D A 1, 33
 Carter, D 75
 Chang Shui-Chi, P 36
 Chapman, J 29
 Charles, R H 30
 Chatman, S 75, 82
 Chomsky, N 43, 45, 58
 clarity principle 70, 98, 104, 163, 172
 Clark, H H & Clark, E V
 Clavier, H 32, 127
 Cloete, T T 64-66, 76, 78, 79, 83
 Colwell, E C 27
 Combrink, J G H 124, 142
 confirmative 122, 152, 157, 158, 181, 182

- constative 64, 103-105, 113, 114, 119, 121-123,
 135-137, 141, 147, 152, 156-159, 166,
 167, 180-182, 187
 conversation opener 116
 Conzelmann, H 33
 Cooperation Principle/CP 68, 69, 70, 74, 75,
 87, 91, 93, 94, 98, 110, 117, 119, 121,
 123, 126, 131, 132, 140, 141, 173, 176,
 186
 Culley, R C 56
 Cullmann, O 33
 Culpepper, R A 32, 34, 37, 38, 54, 60, 82, 83,
 85, 86, 88, 89, 93, 95, 98, 127, 128,
 130-132, 146

 Dalman, G 103, 114
 Daube, D 106
 Dawsey, J M 13
 Deakle, D W 36
 definition of style 49, 50, 53-54
 Deissmann, G A 27
 Derrett, J D M 109
 Derrida, J 195
 descriptive 166, 167
 Dewey, J 36, 149
 Di Marco, A 33
 directive 138, 155, 156, 157, 159, 164, 167, 180,
 182
 disclaimer 145, 173, 180
 display texts 73, 184
 disputative 122, 135
 docilitas 91, 92
 Dodd, C H 29, 124, 147, 172, 173
 Dolezel, L & Bailey, R 39
 Domeris, W R 33
 double meaning 9, 10, 33
 Driver, G R 26
 Duke, P D 32, 33, 54, 111, 127, 128, 129, 130,
 132, 134, 143, 144
 Du Plessis, J G 48, 63, 110
 Du Plessis, T 71, 130, 174
 Du Rand, J A 37

 economy principle 98, 100, 101, 104, 107, 112,
 161, 184
 Edmondson, W 145
 end-focus maxim 70, 164, 165, 185, 190
 end-weight maxim 70, 185
 Engelbrecht, E 37, 146
 Enkvist, N E 41, 46, 50-52, 54

 Eslinger, L 37, 38, 108, 111, 115, 139, 142
 explanatory notes 9, 34, 89, 100
 expressive 143

 felicity conditions 66, 75, 81, 110, 116, 123,
 129, 154
 Felman, S 76
 Fenton, J C 33
 Flanagan, N 33
 flouting a maxim 68, 69, 88, 132, 133, 140,
 170, 186
 formal-functional paradigm 58, 59
 Fortna, R T 17-24, 31
 Fowler, R 42-47, 76
 Fowler, R M 38
 Frazer, B 163
 Freed, E D 17, 24, 25
 Freed, E D & Hunt, R B 17, 24,
 French structuralism 44, 45
 frequency of usage 5

 Gabel, J B & Wheeler, C B 56
 Gächter, P 34
 Giblin, C H 174
 Gignac, F T 13
 Gilleland, M E 88
 Givon, T 75
 Goguel, M 10
 Goodspeed, E J 3, 27
 grammatical style 30, 39
 Grice, H P 47, 48, 68, 70, 74, 130, 140, 174

 Haenchen, E 2, 23, 143
 Halliday, M A K 46, 47
 Hancher, M 55
 Harley, L 75
 Harner, P B 148
 Harris, Z S 43
 Harty, E R 113
 Hatch, E 3
 Hebraisms 12, 25
 Henaut, B W 60, 82
 Hendriksen, W 139
 Hewitt, J P & Stokes, R 144, 145
 Hirsch, E 23
 Holub, R C 32, 37
 Horner, W B 84
 Hoskyns, E C 143
 Howard, W F 10, 13, 26, 29

Huddleston, R O 72
Hughes, P E 13

illocution 65, 66, 83, 84, 104, 105, 114, 117,
121, 122, 136-138, 156-159, 166, 167,
180-182, 187, 198
illocutionary act 65, 66, 67, 78, 83, 84
illocutionary force 65, 72, 79, 92, 99, 101, 115,
116, 119, 123, 126, 135, 141, 142, 143,
144, 147, 152, 161, 164, 172, 178, 180,
184
imperative 98, 99, 115, 116, 121, 138, 141, 156,
157, 164, 167, 168, 173, 180-182
implicature 48, 68, 69, 78, 79, 91, 98, 99, 101,
112, 117, 140, 141, 176, 190, 194
implied author 69, 74-76, 82, 83, 85, 88, 89-94,
101, 108-112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 120-
122, 127, 131-133, 135, 143, 148, 152,
155, 160, 171, 175, 185-187, 189-191,
193, 196, 197
implied readers 38, 75, 82, 88, 98, 108-113,
118, 127, 135, 151, 155, 157, 167, 171,
175, 178, 180, 187, 192, 196, 197
importance of context 77
indirect speech acts 72, 125, 148
informative 68, 91, 102, 103, 104, 137, 147,
156, 163, 167
intentionality 66
interpersonal rhetoric 70, 87, 112, 125, 197
intertext 54, 109, 111, 112, 113, 120, 121, 139,
155, 156, 183, 185, 186, 190, 192, 195
irony 9, 10, 12, 32, 33, 39, 40, 54, 69, 70, 94,
110, 118, 127-134, 136, 137, 139, 142,
151, 153, 162, 169, 170, 171, 174, 186,
190, 191, 194, 197
irony principle 70
Iser, W 37, 93, 98, 100, 176, 186, 198

Jacobs, L D 63
Jauss, H R 37
Jefferson, A 43, 44
Jenkinson, A G 123
Jeremias, J 16, 23
Jónsson, J 127
Jülicher, A 32

Kaufer, D S 130
Käsemann, E 16
Kennedy, H A A 3

Kilian, J vii
Kilpatrick, G D 29, 33, 114
Kippenberg, H G 106
Kotze, P P A 32, 38, 127
Krenkel, M 3
Kriek, H S 102
Kundsin, K 21
Kysar, R 1, 13, 14, 19, 20, 148

Labuschagne, C J 34, 35
Lagrange, M J 103, 174
Lanigan, R L 76
Lanser, S S 55, 66, 76, 79
Lategan, B C 82
Leavis, F R 44
Leech, G N 48, 52-54, 56, 58, 59, 65, 66, 70-72,
76, 87, 98-101, 110, 115, 118, 133, 143,
164, 170, 174, 185, 188
Leidig, E 170
Léon-Dufour, X 33, 36
Leroy, H 33
levels of communication 197
Levinson, S C 163
Lightfoot, R H 124
Lindars, B 115, 139
linguistic criticism 42, 46
linguistics 12, 32, 40, 41-45, 47-49, 50, 54-58,
63, 67, 80, 91, 189
literary criticism 41-45, 48-50, 52, 54
literary devices 12, 31, 36, 54, 130, 194, 199
literary speech situation 68, 73, 74, 93, 112,
197
literary structure 19, 34, 35
locution 65
locutionary act 65, 78, 84, 91
Lombard, H A 34, 89, 99
Longacre, R E 55
Louw, J P 11, 12, 55, 106, 109,
Louw, J P & Nida, E A 47, 103, 108, 168
Lyons, J 46

McConnell, F 56
MacDonald, J 106, 107
McLaughlin, M L 76, 77, 116, 140, 145
Maclean, I 46
McPolin, J 1
MacRae, G W 32, 127, 128
Mair, C 48
Malatesta, E 1, 2
Manson, T W 26, 29

- Martyn, J L 31
 Matera, F J 90
 maxim of agreement 170
 maxim of approbation 70, 142, 143
 maxim of end-focus 70, 164, 165, 185, 190
 maxim of end-weight 70, 185
 maxim of hearer support 145
 maxim of generosity 70
 maxim of manner 68, 70, 86
 maxim of modesty 70, 153
 maxim of morality 70
 maxim of politeness 70
 maxim of quality 68, 70, 129, 131, 132, 133, 145, 173, 176, 178, 179, 182
 maxim of quantity 68, 70, 91, 129
 maxim of relation 68, 70, 116
 maxim of tact 70, 153
 Meeks, W A 31
 Menken, M J J 34
 Menoud, Ph-H 16, 23
 Miller, O 113
 misunderstanding 9, 10, 12, 15, 33, 39, 40, 53, 114, 126, 129-134, 136, 137, 141, 153, 154, 169, 170, 171, 177, 181, 190, 196
 Mlakuzhyil, G 31, 35, 36
 modesty maxim 70, 153
 Montgomery, J A 25
 Morris, L 36, 100, 103, 117, 124, 139, 160, 161, 162, 168, 173
 Moule, C F D 3
 Muecke, D C 128
 Muilenburg, J 33
 mutual contextual beliefs/MCB's 71, 77

 narratee 74, 75, 82
 narrative analysis 37, 38, 82, 85
 narrative art 37
 narrative structure 39, 196
 narratology 37, 46, 54, 58, 79, 81, 197
 narrator 37, 74, 75, 79, 82, 83, 85, 88-90, 93, 94, 96, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 127
 Neiryneck, F 36
 Neufeld, D 63
 New Criticism 44, 45
 new stylistics 42, 48, 49
 Neyrey, J H 111
 Nicol, W 1, 2, 17-19, 21, 23, 24, 31
 Nida, E A 47
 Nida, E A, Louw, J P, Snyman, A H & Cronje, J v W 47
 Nieting, L 12

 Norden, E 21
 numerical patterns 34, 35

 O'Day, G R 32, 33, 54, 103, 115, 127-129, 139, 142, 143, 146-148, 150, 151, 153, 162, 169-175, 177
 O'Grady, J F 1
 Okure, T 100, 101, 103, 106, 107, 109, 115-117, 140, 142, 143, 146-148, 150, 160, 161, 168, 170, 172-175, 177, 183, 184
 Olsson, B 1, 2, 37, 38, 39, 98, 100, 101, 105, 107, 108, 111, 114, 139, 142-144, 146-148, 150, 169-175, 178
 O'Rourke, J J 34, 89

 Pamment, M 36
 parody 110, 118
 participants in a narrative literary work 74
 Patte, D 198
 Pazdan, M M 106, 147
 performatives 64, 65
 perlocution 32, 65, 66, 78, 83, 84, 92, 99, 101, 104, 105, 111, 117, 119, 120, 123, 124, 126, 127, 131, 134, 137, 141, 148, 151, 152, 154-157, 159, 160, 162, 164-167, 169, 176, 181, 182, 185, 187, 198
 perlocutionary act 66, 78, 83, 91
 perlocutionary effect 92, 98, 99, 103, 143, 147-149, 152, 161, 178, 182
 perlocutionary force 165
 Petersen, N R 38
 Phillips, G A 38
 philology 42
 Platt, J T & Platt, H K 46
 Poneis, F A 119, 172
 Poythress, V A 30, 33
 pragmatic opposition 129, 130
 pragmatics 43, 48, 49, 57-59, 64, 81
 Pratt, M L 62, 67-69, 73, 75-77, 80, 83, 86, 87, 89, 90, 112, 131, 164, 184, 196
 predictive 147, 152, 158
 presumptions 71, 92
 principle of charity 70, 98, 163
 principle of clarity 70, 98, 104, 172
 principle of economy 70, 98, 100, 101, 104, 107, 112, 161, 184
 principle of expressivity 70
 principle of irony 70
 principle of politeness 70
 principle of processibility 70

principle of relevance 163

Rabinowitz, I 44

Rainer, W 37

Ransom, J C 44

reader involvement 190

reception theory 37, 38, 39, 54, 58, 62, 78, 81,
189, 195, 198

Reiser, M

Religionsgeschichte 2, 31

Religionsgeschichtliche 15, 21

requestive 121, 138, 167, 180

requirement 182

Resseguie, J L 38

Retief, R 119, 172

retractive 156

Richard, E 33

Richards, I A 44

Richards, I A & Empson, W 44

Richards, K H 38

Ricoeur, P 74

Ridderbos, H N 24

Rimmon-Kenan, S 85

Robertson, A T 3

Robey, D 44

Rowley, H H 26

Roy, A M 129, 130, 133

Ruckstuhl, E 2, 10, 12, 17-19, 22-24

rules and rule-breaking 77, 193

Ryan, R 195

Salmon, G 32

Salom, A P 29

Saussure, F de 44

Schifffrin, D 57, 151

Schlatter, A 25, 27

Schleghoff, E A 72

Schmid, W 75

Schnackenburg, R 1, 28, 29, 34, 89, 92, 100,
103, 107, 124, 142, 143, 146, 147, 150,
161, 171, 172, 174, 175

Schneiders, S M 36

Schulz, S 31

Schweizer, E 2, 10, 17-19, 21-24

Scobie, C H 1

Searle, J R 47, 65-67, 72, 87, 129

semantics 43, 47, 49, 54, 57, 59, 62, 64, 78, 80

Semeia-source 14, 16, 17

semitic influence 28

Semitisms 12, 14, 15, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 55

sentences vs utterances 64

Sidgwick, A 170

Silva, M 12, 27, 47, 146

Simcox, W H 3

Smalley, S S 90

Smith, D M 13, 14, 15, 16, 31, 34, 36

Smith, R H 1

Smit Sibinga J 34

Snyman, A H 63

Snyman, G F 37

source criticism 2, 13, 14, 16

speech act theory, discussion of basic concepts
63-75

speech act theory and style 76-81

Staley, J L 38, 54, 75, 82, 88-90, 93, 101, 102,
108, 110, 111, 118, 149, 150, 185, 186,
191

Stemberger, G 36

Strachan, R H 33

Strawson, P F 47

Stubbs, M 72, 91

Sturch, R L 36

style and Aramaic origin 25

style and choice 190

style and other Johannine writings 28

style and the unity of the Gospel 22

style and sources 13

style characteristics 20, 199

style criteria 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 31

stylistics 18, 39, 40-46

suggestive 159

Suleiman, S R & Crosman, I 37

suppositive 165, 167

synoptic tradition 6

Talbert, C H 33

Taylor, V 26

Teepie, H M 2, 13, 17, 19-21

Tenney, M C 34, 89

Terblanche, C J J 163, 164

the Fourth Gospel as drama 32

textual rhetoric 70, 98, 100, 112, 117, 163

Thistleton, A C 63

Thyen, H 1

Todorov, T 50

Topel, L J 114

Torrey, C C 25, 26

traditional approach 3, 8, 11, 13, 20, 24, 36,
129

traditional view of style 9, 23

Trager, G L & Smith, H L 43

Tragan, P 36

- transformational generative grammar 43, 45
 Traugott, E 80
 Turner, G W 50
 Turner, N 12, 13, 28

 Van Belle, G 1, 31, 32, 34, 39, 54
 Van Coller, H P & Van Jaarsveld, G J 76
 Van Dijk, T A 76
 Van Eemeren, F H & Koning, W K B 76
 Van Halsema, J H 36
 Van Jaarsveld, G J 72, 76
 victimization of readers 101, 102, 108, 149, 191
 Von Wahlde, U C 36
 Vorster, W S 28, 37, 56, 57, 106, 113

 Walker, N 109
 Watson, N 55, 75

 Wead, D W 32, 33, 54, 127, 130
 Welch, J W 33
 Welleck, R & Warren, A 44
 Wendland, E R 48, 63, 116
 Westcott, B F 29, 143
 Westcott, B F & Hort, F J A 7
 Wetter, G P 21
 White, H C 76, 193, 195
 Widdowson, H G 50
 Wierzbicka, A 76
 Willemse, J 31
 Wilson, W G 29
 Wimsatt, W K 44
 Windisch, H 37
 Wrede, D W 37
 Wuellner, W 38
 Wybenga, D M 124

 Zerwick, M 3